

Review of care home provision for adults with learning disabilities

Through robust contract management activity the Joint Commissioning Team is undertaking work to ensure current care home provision for adults with learning disabilities, purchased by Birmingham City Council, is on a sustainable basis and with pricing based on a better understanding of care costs to meet needs.

This will support future work to consolidate an array of different contractual arrangements currently in place with providers, as well as underpin further work around personalisation. This will be with better alignment of resources linked to service user needs as we move towards service users taking greater control over their services through greater use of personal budgets. This activity comes at a time when the financial challenges for learning disability services are substantial, both nationally and here in Birmingham, with numbers requiring care support rising through demographic pressures, at a time when public sector investment is expected to tighten significantly.

What work is the Joint Commissioning Team undertaking?

A programme of reviews of the highest cost residential care placements of adults with learning disabilities made by the City. These reviews (not assessments) will determine if the current care plan for the individuals concerned remains appropriate. Since we are already delivering services to the service users, FACS eligibility has previously been established we do not envisage that reviewing eligibility will form a major part of this review although whether an appropriate contribution from health partners is in place will be considered.

Additionally we are reviewing the pricing of packages by using the care funding calculator to ensure care packages demonstrate best value to the Council. Part of this activity includes determining the number of care hours a person needs. This is also an intrinsic part of the review of care packages being delivered to service users.

Why are we using the Care Funding Calculator (CFC)?

The CFC has been developed by various stakeholders including provider groups as it offers the Council a robust way to:

- * Analyse in detail the level of staff support required to meet an individual's needs as well as identifying objectives for the service user and report on progress

- * Determine a price based on market knowledge, which is appropriate to the needs of the person but with a understanding of providers' services and

cost pressures

This approach is open and transparent with the provider facilitated to contribute to the CFC thus enabling a dialogue and contractual negotiation.

For additional information on the CFC see the SE Improvement & Efficiency Partnership website or following web address:

<http://www.southeastiep.gov.uk/newsstory.asp?PageRef=7&NewsRef=277>

As well the contract negotiations based on the CFC, the Joint Commissioning Team is offering meetings direct with providers to discuss future business plans. This enables both commissioners and providers the opportunity to discuss the development of future provision required for personalised services of people with learning disabilities here in Birmingham.

What can be expected at the reviews?

If the service user has not had a recent review of their care plan then the Reviewing Team will carry out a care management review which the CFC will form part of. The information collected will determine if the current care plan remains appropriate to meet the needs of individuals including identifying the level of care hours required to support an individual. This information will be used to inform the care funding calculator. The information gathered will be used for legitimate purposes in accordance with our statutory obligations.

In all care management reviews the Local Authority will ensure that any information that needs to be shared in advance will be, and that adequate time will be allowed for any information that needs to be collated prior to the review. It is not normal for the local authority to supply forms beforehand and it is not considered to be necessary. The process of review is an ongoing one and if any service user (or his/her family/carer) wishes to supply information after the information or have any matter clarified then this is quite acceptable.

The Local Authority leads the review process and will coordinate the process appropriately including identifying (where appropriate with the service user) who attends and when. The reviewing officer (and where appropriate in consultation with the service user) will determine who attends interviews and review meetings accordingly. In some instances attendance may be restricted as a result of concerns raised by any party.

Which care packages form part of this initiative?

We are currently looking to apply the CFC to residential care packages over a threshold of £1149 per week. This threshold is determined by the highest level of our current contracted fee under our Adults with Specific Needs (ASN) Contract and pricing framework. It represents just under 260 residential care packages.

Response to Freedom of Information Request - FOI 3656

1. A list of the names of the largest 5 providers by value of the contracts with them being reviewed as part of this project/initiative.

The five largest providers determined by costings of relevant contracts are:

- Care Tech
- Autism West Midlands
- Jaffray Care
- Robina Care
- Care Through The Millennium

2. The total number of providers that are being reviewed under the part of the project to scrutinise high cost placements.

The total number of providers being reviewed under the project is 85.

3. The total number of providers with more than 3 placements funded by Birmingham City Council that are to be or are being reviewed as part of the project/initiative to scrutinise high cost placements.

There are 19 providers with more than 3 placements.

4. The names of providers with more than 3 placements being reviewed as part of the project/initiative to scrutinise high cost placements.

The providers with more than 3 placements are:

Alphonsus	Maple Leaf Lodge et al
Autism West Midlands	Platinum Care
Birmingham Institute for the Deaf (bid)	Robina
Care Through the Millennium	Selborne
CareTech	SENSE
Craegmore	Trident
Elizabeth Fitzroy Support	Trevanion House
Forest Grange	United Response
Friendship, Care & Housing	Jaffray
Voyage	

5. The number of providers that have been contacted by 1 December 2009 to review the current contract and/or scrutinise high cost placements.

96 providers were sent a letter in August 2009 detailing the 'New Approach to Contracts' and there were two provider forums (2 June 2009 and 15 Sept 09) in which approximately 250 providers were invited.

6. The definition of a high cost placement. This definition should include the monetary/cost (in terms of the weekly fee paid to the provider of care) above which a placement is defined as a high cost placement for the purposes of the initiative/project being undertaken.

The definition of a high cost placement is a placement costing equal to or more than £1149.29 p/w. This figure is the ceiling to the current ASN contract (residential).

7. The number of providers who have agreed to a review to:

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009**

The Joint Commissioning Team is working jointly with the Learning Disability Service to ensure the high cost packages continue to meet the needs of individuals whilst offering best value. Review activity is a requirement for Local Authorities under community care so it will fulfil this obligation regardless of provider agreement. However all providers to date with varying degrees have understood the need to undertake this work and have cooperated. It is intended that the continued appropriateness of the placement and the fee level that the Local Authority feels is reasonable will be reached with full engagement with providers. We have not received any correspondence to refuse a review to date.

8. The names of providers who have agreed to a review to:

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009**

See response for 7

9. The number of providers who have confirmed that they do NOT agree to a review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009**

We have not received any correspondence to refuse a review to date.

10. The names of providers who have confirmed that they do NOT agree to a review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009**

We have not received any correspondence to refuse a review to date.

11. The number of providers who have neither agreed to nor disagreed to a review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009**

See response for 7

12. The names of providers who have neither agreed to or disagreed to a review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009**

See response for 7

13. The Total Annual Value of placements that Birmingham City Council intends to review as part of this review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009**

The full year value of residential placements above the threshold £1,149 per week is £22,828, 317 as at July 2009.

14. The Total Annual Value of placements that Birmingham City Council intends to review as part of this review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements that providers have confirmed that they agree to a review as at 1 December 2009**

See above and response to Q7

15. The Total Annual Value of placements that Birmingham City Council intends to review as part of this review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements that providers have confirmed that they DO NOT agree to a review as at 1 December 0209**

See response to Q13 and Q7

16. The Total Annual Value of placements that Birmingham City Council intends to review as part of this review to

- a) review the current contract**
- b) to scrutinise high cost placements that providers have confirmed that they have neither agreed to or disagreed to a review as at 1 December 2009.**

See response to Q13 and Q7

17. For EACH provider that has NOT agreed to the carrying out a review of either

- a) the current contract or of**
- b) the scrutiny of high cost placements as at 1 December 2009 - please provide the specific reasons communicated to you by each provider for not agreeing to the reviews.**

No providers

18. For EACH provider who has NOT agreed to a review – provider by provider please provide your responses to them.

See above

19. The number of providers (and the value of the contracts being reviewed) who have been contacted to carry out these reviews by Birmingham City Council but with whom no agreement has been reached after 60 days of your first oral (ie phone call to arrange reviews) communication with them on this matter to arrange the reviews

No providers

20. Please provide copies of the minutes of the meetings held with providers where they have NOT agreed to a review to a) review the current contract b) to scrutinise high cost placements as at 1 December 2009.

No providers

21. A list of the names of the largest 5 providers by value of the contracts with them being reviewed as part of this project/initiative.

See response to Q1