Stakeholders

Advantages

- Control of who is on the scheme
- Minimum standards of quality
- Safeguarding
- Clear what customers should expect
- Independent oversight
- market development
- Cooperation between providers
- Financial advantages

Disadvantages

- Lack of sanctions
- Insufficient monitoring
- Reduction of market choice
- Lack of customer feedback
- No recognition of specialist providers
- Cost of monitoring
- None PP less supported
- System centred not person centred

If there was no PR scheme

- Service level agreements
- self advocates/families monitoring
- Statutory arrangments
- Advocacy services
- Provider arrangements
- Person centred services
- Better signposting

Are there things support workers do for people

- Positive risk taking culture
- PCP
- Steady Development of skills for independence
- Answer door/phone
- Cooking
- Shopping
- Travel
- Decision making
- Personal care
- More use of assistive technology
- Fail to connect with natural supports
- Finance
- Manage medication
- Communicate

What should be included in PP?

- Making use of advocacy
- Engaging families
- Engaging community
- Promoting choice & independence
- Competence with MCA
- Staff training/development
- Person centred approaches across everything they do
- Provider collaboration
- Stakeholder reviews -peer, SA, families
- staff conditions

Stakeholders

Advantages

- **Control of who is on the scheme**
  - Control over who is on the scheme
  - Focuses input from Local Authority
- **Minimum standards of quality**
  - Minimum Standards
  - Some assurance of quality.
  - Sets a minimum standard
  - If they aren't doing the job we have the evidence of agreed standards
  - Clear standard to check providers
  - Sets out standards
  - More regulation and quality assurance
  - Maintain Standards
  - Should push standards up
  - Standardisers Benchmarks
  - Quality assurance
  - Providing standards
- **Safeguarding**
  - Risk and safeguarding
  - Protection and Assurance providers and family
- **Clear what customers should expect**
  - Clarity for people using services and for their family and carers
  - Customer satisfaction
  - Good quality for service user
- **Independent oversight**
  - Independent visitor scheme
  - Accountability
  - Accountability
  - A Regulatory body
  - Contract monitoring
  - Evidence based
  - Contract
- **market development**
  - Identifies gaps in the market
  - Market place Umph !
  - System and structure
- **Cooperation between providers**
  - Enables providers to liase / work together personalisation and choice
  - Better relationships between partners / MDT
- **Financial advantages**
  - Varied payments for different levels of care
  - Giving another provider incentive to improve their services
  - Easier to work out costings for the support needed
  - Value for money

Disadvantages

- **Lack of sanctions**
  - Not robust enough to sanction poor practice in big providers
  - More robust contract
- **Insufficient monitoring**
  - Suggest monitored
  - ? Quality
  - Suggest Quality
  - Cannot assure quality if not properly monitored, - i.e. really drilling down to test out if they deliver what they say they do
  - Gathering intelligence about poor practice is ad hoc
  - Lack of close monitoring of preferred providers due to "case closure" - no active workers involved
  - Good for the day the review is taking place
  - Complacency
  - Lack of monitoring
  - Reactive monitoring
  - Poor monitoring of quality of care
- **Reduction of market choice**
  - Closes market
  - Impacts on choice and control for individuals
  - Forced DP
  - Squeezing small providers out of business who have specialist skills
- **Lack of customer feedback**
  - Customer and stakeholder feedback not routinely gathered.
- **No recognition of specialist providers**
  - No distinction between specialist and non- specialist providers
- **Cost of monitoring**
  - The cost and burden of monitoring
- **None PP less supported**
  - Less support to non-PP from LCC due to focus on PP
- **System centred not person centred**
  - Less PC?
  - Faceless?

Stakeholders

If there was no PR scheme

- **Service level agreements**
  - SLA
- **self advocates / families monitoring**
  - Parents Carers
  - Service users be involved in the quality reviews
  - Quality checkers - Advocacy group
  - Service users be involved in the quality reviews
  - Family and relatives monitoring
  - Valuing carers - ? Payment
  - Range of different people to check quality
  - Communities
- **Statutory arrangments**
  - CQC
  - CQC
  - Review statutory
- **Advocacy services**
  - Use of advocacy
- **Provider arrangements**
  - Peer monitoring
  - Joint approach and monitoring between small and larger providers
  - Better communication between P.P
  - Housing providers
  - Sub contracting
  - Allocated person with agency to audit
  - Joined up services
- **Person centred services**
  - More person centred
- **Better signposting**
  - Increase signposting

Are there things support workers do for people

- **Lack of Positive risk taking culture**
  - • Positive approach to risk taking - needs to be encouraged
  - • Risk
  - • Medicate - Risk / Fear
  - • At the moment risk averse need to take positive risks
  - • Risk averse culture
  - • Systems and structures in place for safety
  - • It's the way things have always been done, rather than moving forward
- **Assessing and planning**
  - • Need for flexibility / back up plan
  - • Good assessment - what does 2:1 support actually look like
  - Preparation of person to do the task and ongoing support
  - • To much emphasis on a goal, instead of starting on the smaller achievable goals
  - • Need to review more frequently
  - • Good assessment and support plan, communication, based on needs
  - • Goals should be reviewed on a regular basis and assessed towards the next step
  - Some individuals could become more independent with having some 1-1 support
- **Domestic**
  - • Shopping
  - • Cooking
  - • Making choices for themselves - decorating, food, shopping
  - • Answering door / phone
  - • Money
- **Travel**
  - • Drive / Travel
  - • Bus journey - Tech
  - • Getting buses taxis (travel training)
- **Doing deciding & speaking for**
  - • Advocate
  - • Facilitating support not control
  - • Making decisions
  - • Safeguarding - not speaking to victim, compiling reports with staff
  - • Support staff often make decisions on individuals behalf
  - Need to take a more pro-active approach to empowerment
  - • Supports can put a barrier in between social skills and networks
  - • Support workers do things for people to make things easier and quicker
  - • Disabling rather enabling
  - • Communicate
  - • People are not given the opportunity to share support or have background support rather than 1-1 intense support
  - • Persevere
  - PCP
  - Accessing activities - computer etc (staff will take lead from other staff) instead of asking SU
  - • Increase independence via skills training
  - • Independent living skills - enable don't disable
- **Personal care**
  - • Personal care (easier than supporting bathing / dressing cleaning self
  - Toilet training Reablement
- **More use of assistive technology**
  - • Assistive technology
  - • "Just checking"
  - Not accessing resources which could increase independence, e.g. assistive technology
  - Emergency services - Skype, Face Time, outreach - Rural
- **More opportunities**
  - More opportunity
  - Warehousing horticultural
  - Activities - e.g., church going
  - Living!
  - Signpost / Broaden