<u>Report on Inclusion Glasgow 23/04/04.</u> Part of the Best Value <u>Service Review Promotion of Independence – Young Disabled</u> <u>People.</u>

Three delegates from Nottinghamshire County Council had the pleasure of visiting Inclusion Glasgow and spending a morning with their Director, Deputy Director, Service Manager front line staff and service users.

The Delegates were:

County Councillor	-	Ellie Lodziak
Chris Cosgrave	-	Day Services Modernisation Officer, Mental
-		Health
Paul Johnson	-	Commissioning Officer, LD

Inclusion Glasgow has a national reputation for providing person-centred, innovative support for learning disabled adults. We were keen to establish whether their model and approaches could inform the design of services in Nottinghamshire.

Historical Background of Inclusion Glasgow

In the mid-90's a team of staff were given the task of closing Lennox Castle, an NHS long stay hospital in Glasgow. They searched for suitable placements and concluded that for many 'patients' the services available were inadequate. The team wanted to provide creative individual local solutions; Simon Duffy was approached to design a service. He had studied in the U.S. and had been influenced by brokerage models favoured by some states.

A sum of £60,000 was granted for setting up Inclusion Glasgow. In 1996 Inclusion Glasgow were given 20 people to re-settle. The funders agreed to pay the equivalent cost of residential care per person £38,000 p.a. The funding, although found to be insufficient for these first 20 people, was crucially placed in **individual service funds** (see later).

A further 10 people were placed and their success since has been dramatic. Inclusion Glasgow have provided supported living services typically for those people that no one else could manage. They currently support 44 people and the organisation has spawned two 'sister' organisations.

a) C – Change (Glasgow)

For people with extreme challenges, typically forensic

b) Partners for Inclusion (Ayrshire)

The relatively short life of Inclusion Glasgow has had 'dramatic periods', but on the evidence of what we observed, their audit report, the awards they have received and the testimonies of the users, their reputation is well deserved.

How do they do it?

The key aspects are:

1) Extremely firm value base.

Each individual is seen as unique and their service is designed around them, with their involvement. Inclusion Glasgow have a policy of zero rejection, to which they have so far lived up to. 'Small is best' and they firmly believe this. The Director stated that if she does not know the support needs of each user (and the needs of the staff) then they are too big. They see their maximum capacity as supporting 40-50 service users. They aim to use people's natural and informed supports wherever possible.

2) <u>Expectations</u>

Inclusion Glasgow expect their services to work. They presume that packages of support will reduce in the long term. Their Director said that in her opinion "too much money can inhibit creativity".

3) Creative, bold and secure individual funding

Initially, Inclusion Glasgow set about using the individual service fund to "broker" services. They did not envisage themselves as providers. However, experience has led them into being providers for most people.

Once the purchasers (Social Services and Health) committed the money, Inclusion Glasgow set up **individual service funds**. Abiding by the rules of these funds is critical for their success.

The rules:

- a) Money attached to each individual is secure
- b) Inclusion Glasgow could spend the money however they and the user choose in order to meet their needs.
- c) A non recurring set up fee of £10,000 would be used to pay for person centred panning, designing the services, recruitment and training.
- d) A maximum of 10% of the fund would be "pooled" into an insurance fund (see below)

e) Budget can be carried forward.

4) Insurance Fund

This fund ensures the ability to sustain the individual budgets over time without having to come back to SSD/Health for more money. Overspends could be off set by under spends elsewhere. As each project is differently funded, those services with less funds can be assisted.

5) Flexible working / contracts

Inclusion Glasgow do <u>not</u> maintain standard terms of conditions/contracts. Staff are in teams - working with particular individuals. The money the individuals have in their funds vary and this needs to be managed by each team.

For example:

If a service has been commissioned for 5 people @ £50,000 per person the staffing, wages and conditions will take this into account. The next service may have a budget of £40,000 per person.

Some 'corrections' can be made centrally using the Insurance Fund, but there is a very strong ethos of devolved budgetary responsibility. If however someone's needs reduce over time, (the funding is secure) decisions can be made about staff salaries, amounts available for training etc. In essence the staff experience a 'reward' for enhancing people's independence.

6) Taking 'bold' decisions

A recent audit report commended their approach to risk taking. The organisation has a hands off approach that helps to replace command and control management. Inclusion Glasgow see themselves there for the 'long-haul' therefore they learn from their mistakes by daring to try things. For example:

- i) They employ relatives if necessary
- ii) They repay call-out money if an individual doesn't use it (this broke an entrenched behaviour for one person who delighted in calling out staff/emergency services etc).
- iii) Rarely using 2:1 staffing. In the Director's opinion 2:1 is often unnecessary, it rarely works as the individual" gets lost" (remember

some of that they are working with some of the most demanding people).

7) Sharing their learning

They have created a membership organisation called "Altrum'- so that they can foster and grow inclusive approaches elsewhere.

Learning for Nottinghamshire

Much of what we learnt could be used in Nottinghamshire - especially with regards to the creation and commissioning of innovative, person centred packages.

Specifically we could consider the following:

- 1) Commissioning/purchasing support from smaller 'not for profit organisations' that are person centred and not risk averse
- 2) When designing complex packages the 'security' and rules of the funding is made clear.
- 3) Providing incentives for success based on outcomes
- Contingency/insurance type elements to packages are developed. N.B. this to some extent is built into recent contracts for learning disability supported living.
- 5) Set-up costs are provided to help ensure packages are robust enough to get over the initial challenges.

Implications for Nottinghamshire SSD/Funders

- Less breakdowns of packages
- Less bureaucracy i.e. contract variations
- Better trust between purchasers and providers

Comm(S)SG:PIYDAIR-AP10