

Meeting: Adult Review Group (ARG)

This meeting took place in London on 13th November. Estelle Buscombe from Sefton MBC is the NW Region representative and reports here for SSRG. The name of the colleague who introduced an item is noted in brackets.

GFS1 Return

(Janice Allen, IC)

The IC proposed some changes to the 2009/10 GFS1 Return. These were discussed by the Group and the following was agreed:

- Name of Scheme – will NOT now be removed from Return (as there could be more than one scheme for an organisation, and to enable year-on-year comparisons). Guidance will be re-phrased slightly to clarify what is needed.
- Further information about a service – This should continue to be recorded in the Comments column.
- Main Primary Client Type – will not now be added as a separate column.

The form will therefore remain the same for the foreseeable future.

There was concern that some Authorities include schemes that they receive a grant for. These must not be included and the guidance will be clarified to say that. Similarly Supporting People money cannot be included. The new guidance should be on the website by January 2009.

Self Directed Support

(Mike Oxley, IC)

Apparently there had been some confusion over whether the term

“Personal budget” or “Individual budget” should be used. To clarify:

Individual budgets refer to money from social services only, and will only be used to refer to the Individual Budget pilot sites.

Personal budgets can include funding from various sources (e.g. ILF) and is the preferred terminology for the upfront allocation of funding to clients following assessment through the Self Directed Support process.

National Indicator NI 125

(Kate Anderson, IC)

The part of the guidance on multi-disciplinary assessments contradicts the first exclusion stated after it. The guidance will therefore be changed to read:

“Exclusions: The following situations are excluded from the table:

- rehabilitation/re-enablement services which are provided solely by social services with no assessment of health needs”.

Abuse of Vulnerable Adults Return

(Matt Cuff, IC)

The pilot has now been carried out and the results analysed. The main purpose of it was to test out the definitions and not to look at trends. However, a summary of the main findings will be

published later on.

There was still concern amongst LA members of the Group about the work involved in collecting and collating the information required for this Return. (There will be a lot of very low numbers and zeros in the tables.) However, it was accepted that it is an important area and should be useful both centrally and locally.

Following the pilot, the IC has reduced some of the tables where they felt the information wasn't useful. That should help LAs a bit, but they accepted that it was still quite a large return.

The IC will talk to IT suppliers to try to develop a system that would make a full return more feasible. They are still looking at collecting the information for a six-month period in 2009/10.

The results from the pilot could lead to changes in the 2009/10 SAS, with the removal of the section on vulnerable adults. CSCI will look at this once the pilot report has been published. (CSCI/ The Care Quality Commission would not have detailed access to the data on the returns.)

RAP Guidance Review

(Gill Birk-Telford, IC)

Some additions and changes to the 2008/09 RAP Guidance and FAQs were proposed and discussed.