

## **Winterbourne View Joint Improvement Programme**

### **Initial Stocktake of Progress against key Winterbourne View Concordat Commitment**

The Winterbourne View Joint Improvement Programme is asking local areas to complete a stocktake of progress against the commitments made nationally that should lead to all individuals receiving personalised care and support in appropriate community settings no later than 1 June 2014.

The purpose of the stocktake is to enable local areas to assess their progress and for that to be shared nationally. The stocktake is also intended to enable local areas to identify what help and assistance they require from the Joint Improvement Programme and to help identify where resources can best be targeted.

The sharing of good practice is also an expected outcome. Please mark on your return if you have good practice examples and attach further details.

This document follows the recent letter from Norman Lamb, Minister of State regarding the role of HWBB and the stocktake will provide a local assurance tool for your HWBB.

While this stocktake is specific to Winterbourne View, it will feed directly into the CCG Assurance requirements and the soon to be published joint Strategic Assessment Framework (SAF). Information compiled here will support that process.

This stocktake can only successfully be delivered through local partnerships. The programme is asking local authorities to lead this process given their leadership role through Health and Well Being Boards but responses need to be developed with local partners, including CCGs, and shared with Health and Wellbeing Boards.

**The deadline for this completed stocktake is Friday 5 July. Any queries or final responses should be sent to [Sarah.Brown@local.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Brown@local.gov.uk)**

An easy read version is available on the LGA [website](#)

**May 2013**

**Winterbourne View Local Stocktake June 2013**

<b>1. Models of partnership</b>	<b>Assessment of current position evidence of work and issues arising</b>	<b>Good practice example (please tick and attach)</b>	<b>Support required</b>
<p>1.1 Are you establishing local arrangements for joint delivery of this programme between the Local Authority and the CCG(s).</p> <p>1.2 Are other key partners working with you to support this; if so, who. (Please comment on housing, specialist commissioning &amp; providers).</p> <p>1.3 Have you established a planning function that will support the development of the kind of services needed for those people that have been reviewed and for other people with complex needs.</p> <p>1.4 Is the Learning Disability Partnership Board (or alternate arrangement) monitoring and reporting on progress.</p> <p>1.5 Is the Health and Wellbeing Board engaged with local arrangements for delivery and receiving reports on progress.</p> <p>1.6 Does the partnership have arrangements in place to resolve differences should they arise.</p> <p>1.7 Are accountabilities to local, regional and national bodies clear and understood across the partnership – e.g. HWB Board, NHSE Local Area Teams / CCG fora, clinical partnerships &amp; Safeguarding Boards.</p> <p>1.8 Do you have any current issues regarding Ordinary Residence and the potential financial risks associated with this.</p> <p>1.9 Has consideration been given to key areas where you might be able to use further support to develop and deliver your plan.</p>			
<p><b>2. Understanding the money</b></p>			
<p>2.1 Are the costs of current services understood across the partnership.</p> <p>2.2 Is there clarity about source(s) of funds to meet current costs, including funding from specialist commissioning bodies, continuing Health Care and NHS and Social Care.</p> <p>2.3 Do you currently use S75 arrangements that are sufficient &amp; robust.</p>			

<p>2.4 Is there a pooled budget and / or clear arrangements to share financial risk.</p> <p>2.5 Have you agreed individual contributions to any pool.</p> <p>2.6 Does it include potential costs of young people in transition and of children's services.</p> <p>2.7 Between the partners is there an emerging financial strategy in the medium term that is built on current cost, future investment and potential for savings.</p>			
<p><b>3. Case management for individuals</b></p> <p>3.1 Do you have a joint, integrated community team.</p> <p>3.2 Is there clarity about the role and function of the local community team.</p> <p>3.3 Does it have capacity to deliver the review and re-provision programme.</p> <p>3.4 Is there clarity about overall professional leadership of the review programme.</p> <p>3.5 Are the interests of people who are being reviewed, and of family carers, supported by named workers and / or advocates.</p>			
<p><b>4. Current Review Programme</b></p> <p>4.1 Is there agreement about the numbers of people who will be affected by the programme and are arrangements being put in place to support them and their families through the process.</p> <p>4.2 Are arrangements for review of people funded through specialist commissioning clear.</p> <p>4.3 Are the necessary joint arrangements (including people with learning disability, carers, advocacy organisations, Local Healthwatch) agreed and in place.</p> <p>4.4 Is there confidence that comprehensive local registers of people with behaviour that challenges have been developed and are being used.</p> <p>4.5 Is there clarity about ownership, maintenance and monitoring of local registers following transition to CCG, including identifying who should be the first point of contact for each individual</p> <p>4.6 Is advocacy routinely available to people (and family) to support assessment, care planning and review processes</p> <p>4.7 How do you know about the quality of the reviews and how good practice in this area is being developed.</p> <p>4.8 Do completed reviews give a good understanding of behaviour support being offered in individual situations.</p>			
<p>4.9 Have all the required reviews been completed. Are you satisfied that there are clear plans for any outstanding reviews to be completed.</p>			

<p><b>5. Safeguarding</b></p> <p>5.1 Where people are placed out of your area, are you engaged with local safeguarding arrangements – e.g. in line with the ADASS protocol.</p> <p>5.2 How are you working with care providers (including housing) to ensure sharing of information &amp; develop risk assessments.</p> <p>5.3 Have you been fully briefed on whether inspection of units in your locality have taken place, and if so are issues that may have been identified being worked on.</p> <p>5.4 Are you satisfied that your Children and Adults Safeguarding Boards are in touch with your Winterbourne View review and development programme.</p> <p>5.5 Have they agreed a clear role to ensure that all current placements take account of existing concerns/alerts, the requirements of DoLS and the monitoring of restraint.</p> <p>5.6 Are there agreed multi-agency programmes that support staff in all settings to share information and good practice regarding people with learning disability and behaviour that challenges who are currently placed in hospital settings.</p> <p>5.7 Is your Community Safety Partnership considering any of the issues that might impact on people with learning disability living in less restrictive environments.</p> <p>5.8 Has your Safeguarding Board got working links between CQC, contracts management, safeguarding staff and care/case managers to maintain alertness to concerns.</p>			
<p><b>6. Commissioning arrangements</b></p> <p>6.1 Are you completing an initial assessment of commissioning requirements to support peoples’ move from assessment and treatment/in-patient settings.</p> <p>6.2 Are these being jointly reviewed, developed and delivered.</p> <p>6.3 Is there a shared understanding of how many people are placed out of area and of the proportion of this to total numbers of people fully funded by NHS CHC and those jointly supported by health and care services.</p> <p>6.4 Do commissioning intentions reflect both the need deliver a re-provision programme for existing people and the need to substantially reduce future hospital placements for new people.</p> <p>6.5 Have joint reviewing and (de)commissioning arrangements been agreed with specialist commissioning teams.</p> <p>6.6 Have the potential costs and source(s) of funds of future commissioning arrangements been assessed.</p>			

<p>6.7 Are local arrangements for the commissioning of advocacy support sufficient, if not, are changes being developed.</p> <p>6.8 Is your local delivery plan in the process of being developed, resourced and agreed.</p> <p>6.9 Are you confident that the 1 June 2014 target will be achieved (the commitment is for all people currently in in-patient settings to be placed nearer home and in a less restrictive environment).</p> <p>6.10 If no, what are the obstacles, to delivery (e.g. organisational, financial, legal).</p>			
<p><b>7. Developing local teams and services</b></p> <p>7.1 Are you completing an initial assessment of commissioning requirements to support peoples' move from assessment and treatment/in-patient settings.</p> <p>7.2 Do you have ways of knowing about the quality and effectiveness of advocacy arrangements.</p> <p>7.3 Do you have plans to ensure that there is capacity to ensure that Best Interests assessors are involved in care planning.</p>			
<p><b>8. Prevention and crisis response capacity - Local/shared capacity to manage emergencies</b></p> <p>8.1 Do commissioning intentions include an assessment of capacity that will be required to deliver crisis response services locally.</p> <p>8.2 Do you have / are you working on developing emergency responses that would avoid hospital admission (including under section of MHA.)</p> <p>8.3 Do commissioning intentions include a workforce and skills assessment development.</p>			
<p><b>9. Understanding the population who need/receive services</b></p> <p>9.1 Do your local planning functions and market assessments support the development of support for all people with complex needs, including people with behaviour that challenges.</p> <p>9.2 From the current people who need to be reviewed, are you taking account of ethnicity, age profile and gender issues in planning and understanding future care services.</p>			

<p><b>10. Children and adults – transition planning</b></p> <p>10.1 Do commissioning arrangements take account of the needs of children and young people in transition as well as of adults.</p> <p>10.2 Have you developed ways of understanding future demand in terms of numbers of people and likely services.</p>			
<p><b>11. Current and future market requirements and capacity</b></p> <p>11.1 Is an assessment of local market capacity in progress.</p> <p>11.2 Does this include an updated gap analysis.</p> <p>11.3 Are there local examples of innovative practice that can be shared more widely, e.g. the development of local fora to share/learn and develop best practice.</p>			

Please send questions, queries or completed stocktake to [Sarah.brown@local.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.brown@local.gov.uk) by 5<sup>th</sup> July 2013

**This document has been completed by**

Name.....

Organisation.....

Contact.....

Signed by:

Chair HWB .....

LA Chief Executive .....

CCG rep.....