

Disability Short Breaks commissioning options

Option 1 – Re-commission on a block contract basis – status quo

Undertake a tendering exercise in November and December 2015 for commissioned Short Breaks provision for a two year period from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2018. This would be on the same basis as at present, with the tender comprising of lots for weekday, weekend and summer activities and commissioning on a block contract basis.

Advantages

- The current commissioning arrangements for Short Breaks provision has resulted in a range of activities that are of high quality and show a high level of satisfaction from young people and parents/carers.
- There is a high level of uptake of commissioned Short Breaks

Disadvantages

- The current commissioning arrangements are not responsive to personalisation or personal budgets.
- There are capacity issues and pressures in relation to commissioned activities i.e. there is limited provision for children aged 5-11 years and limited provision over the summer period.
- There are staff recruitment and retention issues for providers, which is particularly acute when we near contract end date.
- The block commissioning arrangement discourages the market place developing.

Option 2 – An approved provider framework with full personal budgets

Through a robust Resource Allocation System (RAS), Children & Young People will be awarded a personal budget based on need to purchase Short Breaks of their choosing from a range of providers who are on an approved provider framework. The framework will be quality checked to ensure that providers meet necessary service standards.

Advantages

- This arrangement would lend itself to full personalisation and would be in line with government expectations under the Children & Families Act and Care Act.
- This arrangement will facilitate choice and control by families.
- This arrangement will help in developing the Short Breaks market.
- There will be an upskilling of universal providers

- Through individual approaches, there will be a wider range of Short Break options i.e. As well as the current group activities, 1:1 and other activities will be developed.

Disadvantages

- A potential loss of the current quality provision
- Current provision is not sustainable without a block contract, as it's not structured to operate on an individual payment basis
- The market is not developed and there will, in all likelihood, be limited Short Break activities for families to purchase
- If families choose 1:1 provision, then there is currently a lack of Personal Assistants (PA's) in Rotherham
- A robust RAS would have to be developed between now and early in 2016
- It may cause financial pressure on the Short Breaks budget, as it's unclear as to what the RAS scores would be and therefore there may be more higher level packages than anticipated. The process would also be challengeable
- There would be no Short Breaks service offer for families that did not wish to take a personal budget
- The system would create disparities between commissioned and in-house provision.

Option 3 – Re-commission Short Break provision and undertake a personal budget pilot project

Undertake a competitive tendering exercise in November and December 2015, with a view to having providers in place from 1 April 2016 with flexible contracts that allow providers to income generate.

In addition, there would be a personal budget pilot with a representative sample of between 20 and 40 families, with a RAS in place that would determine the level of personal budget. These families would be able to either purchase from the commissioned Short Breaks provision or from a provider of their choosing. The pilot would be fully evaluated in the third quarter of 2016/17.

Advantages

- This arrangement would allow a gradual move to personalisation and would be in line with government expectations under the Children & Families Act and Care Act.
- This arrangement will facilitate initial choice and control by families.
- This arrangement will help in developing the Short Breaks market.

- Through individual approaches, there will be a wider range of Short Break options i.e. As well as the current group activities, 1:1 and other activities will be developed.
- This arrangement will minimise the risks of destabilising the market through having a small pilot and not offering personal budgets to all families in receipt of Short Breaks.

Disadvantages

- The market is not developed and there will, in all likelihood, be limited Short Break activities for families to purchase other than the commissioned activity.
- If families choose 1:1 provision, then there is currently a lack of Personal Assistants (PA's) in Rotherham
- A robust RAS would have to be developed between now and early in 2016
- It may cause financial pressure on the Short Breaks budget, as it's unclear as to what the RAS scores would be and therefore there may be more higher level packages than anticipated. The process would also be challengeable.
- Families may choose not to purchase activities other than the commissioned provision, which would create a financial pressure.