

**Modernising Day and Employment Services for People with a Learning Disability**

**Options Matrix**

*STATEMENTS IN ITALICS ON OPTIONS 1, 2 AND 3 ARE COMMENTS FROM CONSULTATION EVENTS*

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Darlington Borough Council ceases to be a provider of day and employment services during 2011/12.</b></p> <p><b>All current services are closed, and service users are transferred to personal budgets or services commissioned in the independent sector.</b></p>	<p>Immediate release of funds for use as personal budgets</p> <p>People would receive SSAQ for support to better identify needs to outcomes. <i>Change can encourage independence</i></p> <p>Takes forward the council’s objective of increasing numbers of people accessing personal budgets <i>Could increase choice, and availability of services and support at other times of day</i></p> <p>Council can focus on commissioning of support and services which are specified and monitored for quality, outcomes and value for money. <i>There would be a robust contract, standards and quality assurance</i></p> <p>Opportunity to improve facilities and venues.</p>	<p>Significant disruption for service users and their carers with possible loss of friendship groups.</p> <p>Significant redundancies (with associated costs) TUPE would apply but may be a disincentive for independent/ 3<sup>rd</sup> sector providers.</p> <p>Significant immediate pressure on council assessment and care management services.</p> <p>Some people now in ‘employment’ services would be reassessed as long-term care (this will happen through personalised reviews even if services continue to be provided by DBC)</p> <p><i>Much more information would need to be provided re options available in the independent sector</i></p> <p><i>People not made welcome in mainstream, and few universal services have adequate facilities for people with physical care needs.</i></p>

Appendix 2

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
		<p><i>May provide access to better environments. Services would be commissioned that meet needs of specific groups e.g. long-term activities or time-limited employment and life-skills development with outcomes. Could stimulate the Market</i></p> <p>The application of Fairer Contributions policy would provide income to Council and equality of financial assessment for all those receiving long-term care which currently is applied to those with highest care needs</p>	<p><i>There is concern amongst carers about the ‘profit motive’ in the independent sector. There is concern re the quality and longevity of services in the independent sector.</i></p> <p><i>Provider development required.</i></p> <p><i>The Council currently leases a number of premises from a number of community organisations, withdrawal of funding may impact on viability of these community premises</i></p>
2	<p><b>Darlington Borough Council ceases to be a provider of day and employment services during 2011/12.</b></p> <p><b>Alternative providers for current services are sought either through transfer to the independent sector, or through the formation of community interest companies, or social enterprises – would need to be financially viable and reduce capacity of sites.</b></p>	<p>Release of funds for use as personal budgets</p> <p>People would receive SSAQ for support to better identify needs and outcomes.</p> <p>Takes forward the council’s objective of increasing numbers of people accessing personal budgets.</p> <p><i>Staff, service users and carers could have more control over services and support</i></p> <p>Companies formed from staff groups will prevent loss of dedicated and experienced staff.</p> <p><i>Could maintain or enhance quality, enthusiasm, knowledge and expertise of staff</i></p>	<p>Not all Council services are likely to be attractive to independent sector provided because of TUPE.</p> <p>Viability for development of community interest companies and social enterprises would need assessment, and support over a long period of time.</p> <p><i>Would need interest, commitment, and time from staff and carers, and older carers might find this too much.</i></p> <p><i>Would need significant investment of business, management and financial expertise</i></p> <p><i>Responsibility for staff service, users and carers would be greater.</i></p>

Appendix 2

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
		<p>Council can focus on commissioning of support and services which are specified and monitored for quality, outcomes and value for money. <i>Could provide scope for reinvestment, to develop new services and ‘grow the business’.</i></p> <p>Opportunity to improve facilities and venues. <i>May provide access to better environments.</i></p> <p>Services would be commissioned that meet needs of specific groups e.g. long-term activities or time-limited employment and life-skills development with outcomes. <i>Could stimulate the Market</i></p> <p>The application of Fairer Contributions policy would provide income to Council and equality of financial assessment for all those receiving long-term care which currently is applied to those with highest care needs</p>	<p><i>Need people prepared to take on these responsibilities.</i></p> <p><i>Staff terms and conditions and pension arrangements could change</i></p> <p><i>Potential conflict of interests for staff and carers on Boards would need to be financially viable and reduce capacity of sites.</i></p> <p>Significant immediate pressure on council assessment and care management services.</p> <p>Some disruption for service users and their carers with possible loss of friendship groups</p> <p>Some people now in ‘employment’ services would be reassessed as long-term care (this will happen through personalised reviews even if services continue to be provided by DBC)</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>A number of services currently run by Darlington Borough Council are closed to maximise viability of those continuing to run.</b>	<p>Immediate release of some funds for use as personal budgets.</p> <p>Wasted capacity would be removed and efficiency savings made whilst still providing</p>	<p>Significant disruption for those individuals whose services close and some disruption for other’s where new members are absorbed.</p> <p>Further change will be inevitable for some individuals</p>

Appendix 2

	Options	Advantages	Disadvantages
		<p>for current services users.</p> <p>People would receive SSAQ for support to better identify needs to outcomes. <i>Change can encourage independence</i></p> <p>Application of Fairer contributions policy would provide income to Council and equality of financial assessment for all those receiving long-term care which currently is applied to those with highest care needs.</p> <p>Takes forward the council’s objective of increasing numbers of people accessing personal budgets <i>Could increase choice, and availability of services and support at other times</i> <i>Would support continuity of staffing and service quality.</i></p> <p><i>Increased staffing on retained centres would allow for more variety of activity, ad pooling of staff skills</i></p> <p><i>Bases with good facilities, and space e.g. for wheelchairs would be retained</i></p> <p><i>People feel safer with council provided services</i></p>	<p>and families <i>Larger groups in service could lead to a reduction in individual attention, and change group dynamics.</i></p> <p>Some redundancy costs (but can be mitigated through ending of short term contracts)</p> <p>Significant immediate pressure on council assessment and care management services. <i>There would be risks if care was not taken to ensure the right ‘mix’ of people and abilities in services.</i></p> <p><i>Individual transport plans would need to be reviewed.-</i> <i>Changes in travelling distances could disrupt individual travel plans</i></p> <p><i>Changes would need to be carefully handled and continuity of friendships and relationship with staff supported.</i></p> <p>Some people now in ‘employment’ services would be reassessed as long-term care.</p>

Appendix 2

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
		<p><i>Supports a phased programme to achieve the Councils longer term business aims</i></p>	
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b><i>One big central building is built which all people with a learning disability can access during the day.</i></b></p> <p><i>Suggestion at consultation meeting</i></p>	<p>Convenient</p> <p>May offer some economies of scale</p>	<p>Continues segregation of people with a learning disability.</p> <p>Runs counter to principles of Valuing People Now</p> <p>Does not achieve council objectives of withdrawal from large scale provision, or personalisation</p> <p>No release of funds.</p> <p>High costs of capital for building, and revenue for staff and running costs</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b><i>Nothing changes</i></b></p> <p><i>Suggestion at consultation meeting</i></p>	<p>Minimum disruption</p>	<p>No release of funds for personalisation or for efficiency savings.</p> <p>Services will eventually have to close as they are financially unviable as numbers reduce.</p> <p>Not all services currently meet individuals supported needs.</p> <p>No modernisation of services, and not all venues provide ideal environments</p>

Appendix 2

	Options	Advantages	Disadvantages
			<p>Does not achieve council objectives of withdrawal from large scale provision, or personalisation.</p> <p>Will still require care management time to review individuals to ensure service meets their needs and outcomes with possible further reduction in numbers of attendance.</p>
6	<p><b>A combination of 1, 2 and 3 above.</b></p> <p><b>A managed phased reduction in council run provision over a four year period, starting with the immediate closure of three (or four) services following reviewing of all service users , an increase in the use of personal budgets and commissioned services in the independent sector, with an intention that, by 2015 the council will not be a provider in this area.</b></p> <p>Initial findings would indicate</p>	<p>Allows phasing of changes, and development of how support needs and outcomes will be met by services in the future.</p> <p>Allows phasing of the management of consequences for individuals, carers, staff and organisations from which premises are currently reused.</p> <p>Closure of expensive and some less than ideal venues to focus on development of continuing services by carers, or staff (as per option 2).</p> <p>Time for personalisation and the market to develop.</p> <p>Immediate release of some funds for use as Personal budgets.</p>	<p>Retains uncertainty for those individual who choose to remain in council provided services; ‘when will my service change and what will it look like?’</p> <p>Possible loss of friendship groups.</p> <p>Some people now in ‘employment’ services would be reassessed as long-term care.</p> <p>Will still require care management time to review individuals to ensure service meets their needs and outcomes with possible further reduction in numbers of attendance</p>

Appendix 2

	<b>Options</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
	<p>that the following would be in phase 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grange – lease come to end, met in the future.</li> <li>• Lowson Street – expensive service to run and poor outcomes for people</li> <li>• Grassroots – premises inadequate and peoples needs could be supported elsewhere.</li> <li>• Lifestyles – predominantly older people who could be supported through more appropriate service</li> </ul>	<p>Takes forward the council’s objective of increasing numbers of people accessing personal budgets</p> <p>People would receive SSAQ for support to better identify needs and outcomes.</p> <p><i>Could increase choice, and availability of services and support at other times of day</i></p>	