

Putting People First Personalisation Toolkit

A Person-Centred Individual Budget Review Process

Individual Budgets pilot sites have been exploring opportunities to streamline 'assessment' processes across up to six funding streams¹. Where possible, sites have maximised opportunities to reduce inefficiencies and improve customer experience through reducing duplication and aligning processes. This development has created the opportunity to explore and begin to identify where possibilities may exist to create a joined-up 'review' process across the six funding streams, for local councils involved in the pilot project. This document is provided as part of sharing the learning from the Individual Budget Pilot Programme. *Nothing in this report overrides existing statutory responsibilities or policy guidance. Voluntary adoption of any of the examples of practice cited here should be undertaken in light of councils' own legal advice.*

¹ Independent Living Fund (ILF), Integrated Equipment & Community Services (ICES), Access to Work (AtW), Social Care (SC), Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) and Supporting People (SP)

How successfully have pilot sites been able to align and integrate the review processes to date?

As part of the process for the development of a 'joined up' review, pilot sites were asked to provide information about their emerging review processes, particularly across funding streams (where applicable) to reduce the number of individual reviews which the customer would therefore need to experience. What was evident from sites was the principle of focussing on outcomes. Many sites are developing review processes which build on the fundamental principles of self determination, although the greatest progress in this area appears to have been made in the review of the social care funding element of Individual Budgets, and appears to be at an early implementation or developmental stage.

Each funding stream currently has specific requirements for review. As a result, people are subject to different reviews, usually at different times by different people. We wanted to see if there was an opportunity to develop a person centred review process, which could accommodate the requirements of each funding stream, removing duplication where possible, which was adaptable locally, and that would improve the customer experience.

How this review format was developed

We brought together a small group of people representing each of the six different funding streams included in the Individual Budget Pilot, to co-produce a review format which could be shared with pilot sites and people using individual budgets, and which could be refined, tested and developed further. The process that we used to develop the joined-up review process was to collectively:

- Share something that is working well from the current review processes for each funding stream.
- Build on this and identify the key outcomes that each funding stream require
 - Compliance with governance
 - To be person-centred and
 - To focus on independent living²/recovery³ and social inclusion)
- Explore what outcomes we think disabled people and older people would want to achieve (from policy and good practice)⁴
- Discuss the principles underpinning the support planning process and Individual Budget process
- Explore what these meant for the design of a new, joined-up process
- Develop a process that builds on what is going well; maintains the outcomes currently reviewed; addresses the outcomes that we think disabled and older people want to achieve; and fits with the principles that we identified.

2 Independent Living definition “all disabled people having the same choice, control and freedom as any other citizen – at home, at work, and as members of the community. This does not necessarily mean disabled people ‘doing everything for themselves’, but it does mean that any practical assistance people need should be based on their own choices and aspirations.”
(Disability Rights Commission (2002) Policy Statement on Social Care and Independent Living).

3 ‘Recovery’ and ‘social inclusion’ are terms often used by people who may have mental health difficulties and the workers who support them to describe an approach based on the principles of independent living as defined above.

4 We shared key areas drawn from the ‘Eleven Basic Needs’ adapted by the Hampshire Coalition of Disabled People, which define Independent Living, ‘Keys to Citizenship’ (developed by Simon Duffy) and ‘Living Well in Later Life – An agenda for national and local action to improve the lives of older people in Britain in the 21st Century’, identified through consultation by the Older People Programme

The principles underpinning this review format

We developed principles that we thought needed to underpin a new, joined-up, review process.

The principles are that a joined-up, person-centred review should:

- Use the support plan, and identify any changes required
- Be flexible (particularly around the timings of the review)
- Avoid duplication, and still have all the relevant information required by the funding streams
- Be simple to fill out, and not require filling out lots of paperwork or multiple visits
- Ask about achievements – what is going well for people, as well as what is not working
- Can result in sharing learning
- Be 'light touch' and proportionate
- Can be developed further by councils

- Be a process that demonstrates a partnership approach across agencies and with the person
- Have the person at the centre, In Control of the process, and involve their friends and family if they choose.

The group used these principles to develop a proposed review format.

The proposed person-centred review format

Area	What is working?	What is not working?	What are your priorities for change? red: high priority amber: medium priority green: low priority
1 Support/assistance Advocacy Peer support			
2 Family and relationships Having choices & taking risks			
3 Income and benefits			
4 Keeping healthy Feeling safe			
5 Information Education and training Employment			
6 Active citizenship			
7 Access to goods and services Leisure			
8 Housing Equipment Transport			
Anything else?			

- When will you revise your support plan (if necessary)?
- Who will do this?
- Will anyone need to OK these changes?

How does this meet the requirements of the different funding streams?

We identified each of the areas that would need to be completed to meet the requirements of the different funding streams.

Every funding stream would require the information from

- Income and benefits
- Information.

Funding Stream	Minimum Information required
Supporting People	Active citizenship Support/assistance Advocacy Peer support Family and relationships Keeping healthy Staying safe Education and training Employment Housing
Independent Living Fund	Support/assistance Family and friends Keeping healthy Staying safe Leisure Housing
ICES	Equipment Keeping healthy Staying safe Access to goods and services
Social Care Funding	ALL
Access to Work	Education and training Employment Equipment Transport Support/assistance
Disabled Facilities Grants	Housing Equipment Transport Keeping healthy Staying safe

The process of the review

One of the principles underpinning the review is flexibility. There are different ways for the review process to take place. Fundamentally, ask the individual how they want to complete their review. Here are some possibilities:

- Send the review format to the individual to complete and then meet up to look at the information
- Ask the person who they want to involve in the review and where they want to have it
- See if people want to do their review with others who are doing their review at the same time

Issues to be considered

In developing this review process, a number of issues emerged:

- How can carers, and the council share their views in the review process?
One possibility would be for them to use the same format to record their views.
- Would it be possible to explore how one organisation could take the lead role in the coordination of the joined-up review process? Would this require a different way of working to arrange a single joined-up review?
- Would it be possible to have a clear, shared understanding about what happens to any underspend? Could the funding streams issue guidance to local authorities on this?
- Could we capture information from funding streams nationally, including how they are used in Individual Budgets?

Mental Health and a joined-up review process

Whilst 'health' funding was not an income stream included as part of the Individual Budget pilot process, it is important to ensure that any joined-up review process also takes account of and synchronizes with Mental Health/Care Programme Approach (CPA) (i.e., integrated health and social care process).

This holistic view enables people to have flexibility in meeting their needs by choosing the balance of health intervention and social

care support that works best for them at any given time. In this way people have been able to manage times of crisis through increased use of personal assistance support at home, rather than their previous hospital admission.

For this reason, at review in accordance with the FACS (2002) and CPA (1999) Guidances, it is essential that a person's level of need is based on their mental health (holistic health and social care needs) and not simply on social care factors.

Authors: Helen Sanderson and Katy Murray, Care Services Improvement Partnership

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the Department of Health, the Office of Disability Issues, Department for Communities and Local Government, the Department for Work & Pensions, and the funding stream and government department representatives.

