

Demonstrator project to explore the introduction of Individual Service Fund (ISF) as a delivery mechanism to facilitate personalisation in Adult Social Care



Centre for
Independent
Living CIC

Final Report

April 2014

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Remit of SPECTRUM Project from Southampton City Council:	1
1.2	What SPECTRUM is contracted to do:	2
2	THE PROJECT DETAIL	3
2.1	Inputs	3
2.1.1	Customer Profile (from Statement of Special Educational Needs – including amendments)	3
2.1.2	Fulfilling the 2-5 Customer Target	4
2.1.3	What SPECTRUM could have done about lack of referrals, if anything?..	5
2.1.4	SPECTRUM governance of project	5
2.1.5	Provision of the service	6
3.	OUTPUTS.....	7
3.1	Activities/events	7
3.1.1	Recruitment	7
3.1.2	Parental Involvement in the project.....	8
3.1.3	Recording of information.....	9
3.1.4	Funding/Invoice/Payment Arrangements	9
3.1.5	Materials Produced.....	10
3.2	Other Stakeholder Meetings.....	13
3.2.1	Education/School Meetings: Cedar School.....	13
4.	OUTCOMES	16
4.1	Outcomes against ‘Making It Real’ markers:	16
4.1.1	Information & Advice: Having the information I need, when I need it.	16
4.1.2	Active & Supportive Communities: Has this initiative helped you maintain involvement with your friends, families and your community:.....	17
4.1.3	Flexible integrated care and support: my support, my own way.....	18
4.1.4	Workforce: My support staff.....	18
4.1.5	Risk enablement: Feeling in control and safe.	19
4.1.6	Personal Budgets: My money.....	19
4.2	Any Culture Change in Relationships Between Customers, Provider and The Local Authority	20

4.2.1	Child/family and Education Department (quotes from SEN Inspector):...	20
4.2.2	SPECTRUM and Education Department (quotes from SEN Inspector):	20
4.2.3	SPECTRUM and teaching profession (quotes from Jonathan Howell, Head of Cedar School):	20
4.2.4	Council and child/family/ and SPECTRUM:	20
4.2.5	SPECTRUM with child/family and Council Services:	21
5	BARRIERS AND SOLUTIONS	22
5.1	ISF specific:	22
6	FINANCE STATEMENT	26
6.1	Grant to measure and evaluate the benefits; dis-benefits of using an ISF to deliver education services:	26
6.2	Management Fee for provision and management of the ISF	27
6.3	Cost Effectiveness of an ISF:	28
6.4	Economies of scale	29
7	CONCLUSIONS	30
8	RECOMMENDATIONS	31
8.1	Service user engagement & involvement – choice and control	31
8.2	Collaborative working with other health and social care professionals and non-service providers	31
8.3	Management of ISF delivered as a PB	32
8.4	Provider role	32
8.5	Service provision	32
	APPENDIX 1:	34
	Parent Questionnaire	34
	Child Questionnaire/completion by parent/carer	40
	Teacher Questionnaire	43

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Remit of SPECTRUM Project from Southampton City Council:

This is a one-off “Demonstrator” project to explore the introduction of an Individual Service Fund (ISF) as a delivery mechanism to facilitate personalisation in Adult Social Care.

Two organisations are involved in the “Demonstrator” - Southampton Mencap and SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living. Both organisations will be helping Southampton City Council (SCC) explore different models of an ISF to enable a full “compare and contrast” evaluation.

We will develop and deliver an ISF “offer” to individual customers of Southampton Children Services, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND).

Title: *“Demonstrator” project to explore the introduction of an Individual Service Fund (ISF) as a delivery mechanism to facilitate personalisation in Adult Social Care.*

Duration: 1 January 2013 to 31 March 2014 (15 months). (Extension to the end of April 2014 for submission of final report)

Aims/Outcomes:

The project aims to enable the benefits / disbenefits of an ISF to be identified from the viewpoint of customers (and their Carers), providers and the local authority. Outcome measures will include evaluation of:

- Customer choice and control over services;
- Customer (and Carers) satisfaction;
- Impact on Transition;
- Culture change in relationships between customers, provider and the local authority;
- Cost effectiveness.

We will also collect information during the course of the project to inform an assessment of:

- The potential future demand for ISF;

- The impact of ISF on the likelihood of progression to full Direct Payments.

1.2 What SPECTRUM is contracted to do:

We will work with SEND customers who, in agreement with Children's Services, wish to explore a different way of having their education needs met in preparation for fully integrated Personal Budgets (PB).

Our target will be to establish and implement a **minimum** of 2 x ISF Agreement by April 2013 (up to a maximum of 5).

Our pilot will identify and "test out" the service practices necessary to constitute an ISF tailored for any individual as required e.g. may include support planning, brokerage, PB account management, staff employment etc. This will include establishing the necessary individual recording and accounting systems to report to our customers and to enable an analysis of our own SPECTRUM costs in delivering the ISF service. We will record all actions in detail and, jointly with Mencap, produce a "Step-by step" Guide at the end of the pilot to inform other providers. Our pilot will be testing the costing premise of charging a % rate of the individual's PB for the ISF service. For the purposes of the pilot we have agreed a rate with SEND Services of 17.5% to cover the costs of managing the service.

The principles of person-centred working and co-production will govern service delivery and all ISF materials we produce will be in accessible formats. We will hold consultation / briefing sessions for customers (and their carers) and any staff/volunteers as well as specifically collating feedback from all parties at project start, mid-point and end.

We will provide an "Interim Report" on the pilot in August 2013 (extended to end of September due to school summer breaks), and a "Final Report" in March 2014 (extended to end of April 2014).

A decision will be made by SCC for the continuation of any ISF in the last 2 months of the pilot – dependent on the pilot findings and negotiation between all parties.

2 THE PROJECT DETAIL

2.1 Inputs

The project only supported 1 child/family. See (2.1.2) for why the other children/families did not take up the Special Educational Needs Disability (SEND) offer and other issues that impacted on take-up.

2.1.1 Customer Profile (from Statement of Special Educational Needs – including amendments)

The child we supported is now 7 years old and is the youngest of eight children. The child lives at home with her mother, brothers and sisters. The child has previously attended mainstream nursery provision, but due to continuing health issues resulting in limited attendance, was withdrawn from the mainstream educational provision at her mother's request. The parent made the decision to educate the child at home and asked for the options available.

The child has multiple impairments and health issues which affect her inclusion in education and her educational learning programme. The Statement of Special Educational Needs – including amendments, was used as the basis for developing the child's learning programme by SPECTRUM's teacher. Advice was also sought from Jonathan Howells, Head Teacher from Cedar School, who confirmed the learning programme developed was fit for purpose and covered all necessary national curriculum criteria as relevant to the child's Statement of Educational Needs.

The parent (mother) owns her own business and was largely absent during the day when the child was receiving home education. An adult daughter was the main carer in the mother's absence and also provided support under the Direct Payments scheme at nighttimes. The family are from a Black and Minority Ethnic Community (BME), which was taken into account in the provision of teaching services.

The family were described as a "hard to reach" family by the SEND Inspector who reported that education, health and social care professionals had found accessing the child a challenge. SPECTRUM's project team working on the Demonstrator Project also found that the family were difficult to access in terms of the grant evaluation process.

However, the teacher SPECTRUM employed to provide home education to the child encountered no issues with accessing the child and adult daughter to provide the home education provision.

2.1.2 Fulfilling the 2-5 Customer Target

There had been a potential 3 children/families at the start of the Demonstrator Project; only 1 of which subsequently took up the SEND offer.

The child/family who took up the offer:

The parent decided that mainstream education provision was unsuitable for their child due to health issues resulting in the child's frequent absence and then being removed from mainstream school entirely. This resulted in the child receiving at best intermittent, and then no education at all. SEND reviewed the options with the parent (a Service Level Agreement was initially considered with SPECTRUM), and then subsequently an ISF was agreed upon with the parent to deliver a Personal Education Budget for home education managed by SPECTRUM.

The 2 children/families who did not take up the offer:

SPECTRUM has been reliant on referrals to the project from Southampton Children Services, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) through the SEND Inspector.

The SEND Inspector was interviewed on 29 August 2013 to establish the reasons why the 2 children/families had not taken up the SEND offer:

Child 1: The family had 2 children: 1 child with no SEND statement (older child- who was already home educated) and 1 child with SEND needs. Mother wanted her younger child with SEND statement to be home educated along with the older child. Therefore, the parent refused the SEND offer.

Child 2: Early in the project development, child/family was deemed to be unsuitable by SEND due to the complexity of their circumstances. SPECTRUM provided a once only provision as per Southampton City Council contract to pay for some support provision (without providing

that provision). The SEND Inspector noted that this child/family had never really been part of the project so are only included here for completeness.

Other factors contributing to only 1 child/family:

The SEND Inspector reported that although Southampton Children Services were pleased with the progress of the project, the Department for Education (DfE) were not so keen on this model. The DfE representative quoted by the SEN Inspector in this report was concerned that this provision "...would set a precedent for other home educators seeking funding without SEND statements."

Why the Project went ahead with only 1 child/family:

"The original intention was for 2 children to have 5 hours per week teaching time each plus 5 extra hours for planning etc. But one family decided not to go forward with this and so it went ahead for just 1 user."

Development Worker, Southampton City Council.

2.1.3 What SPECTRUM could have done about lack of referrals, if anything?

In the proposed measurable targets of the Grant Project proposal, SPECTRUM had suggested holding consultation / briefing sessions for customers (and their carers) and any staff/volunteers to help promote understanding of personalisation, personal budgets and the ISF option. However, as the project progressed it was understood that publicity was deemed inappropriate - as explained above in (2.1.2).

2.1.4 SPECTRUM governance of project

As the delivery of ISF in general and supporting children in particular was a departure from SPECTRUM's standard work remit (adults), the Management Committee (MC) in their governance role was asked for approval, they ratified the project. The MC received frequent updates/progress reports at its monthly committee meetings. The project manager/assistant was directly accountable to the MC for all aspects of the project.

2.1.5 Provision of the service

Educational services to the child/family were provided by a SEND qualified teacher, recruited, employed and managed by SPECTRUM on behalf of the child/family using their ISF funding in the form of a Personal Education Budget.

The initial teaching hours agreed were based upon the time required to support 2 children/families who were involved at the start of the project/recruitment process. This totalled 15 hours for the support of 2 children/families (5 hours for each child for home education and 5 support hours). When 1 of the children/families withdrew from the project at short notice and as the recruitment process had already begun, the SEND Inspector directed SPECTRUM to go ahead and recruit the teacher based on 15 hours per week so as not to put into question the teacher's successful recruitment and not to compromise the child/family ready to take up the SEND offer of home education.

The teacher is paid for a total working week of 15 hours. The SEND Inspector designed and approved a work pattern of 5 hours of home education and 10 hours for the preparation of resources and to assess the child's progress and professional development and supervisory support/training requirements.

Southampton City Council's, SEND Inspector, assisted SPECTRUM in practical issues such as the recommendation of a provider for supervisory/training support for SPECTRUM's teacher (subsequently negotiated with Jonathan Howell, Head Teacher from Cedar School for Deputy Head to provide supervisory support), and salary scale and employment law issues (establishing pension liabilities) through her contact with specialist teacher union representation. SPECTRUM consulted with/commissioned acknowledged experts to support the organisation's "learning curve" and ensure the provision of a quality service.

In addition, SPECTRUM's teacher is assisting the project team with evaluation processes under the Demonstrator Project within her 15 hours.

3. OUTPUTS

3.1 Activities/events

3.1.1 Recruitment

With the support of the SEND Inspector, a standard recruitment process was followed, as per SPECTRUM's Recruitment Policy, to find a suitably qualified/experienced teacher to support the child's educational provision. The SEND Inspector, parent and a member of the project team were all involved in the process.

We developed a Job Description and Person Specification to enable recruitment of the teacher based on providing personalised teaching in a home setting.

An advert was placed on the Hampshire County Council/ (shared by Southampton) recruitment website. We received 11 applications within the deadline specified.

Shortlisting and interview questions were agreed between the SEND Inspector and a member of the project team to ensure relevant specialist teaching areas were covered as well as the ethos of personalisation and the Social Model of Disability.

In addition, a member of the SPECTRUM project team suggested that the parent should be on the interview panel. This was a new concept for the SEND Inspector who however, readily agreed to the proposal and reported subsequently how successful the process had proved and how it had changed her attitude to co-produced recruitment. The SEND Inspector stated that she was, "impressed that the parent came to the same decision about the successful candidate as herself."

The applicants were reduced to 4 via a short listing process (conducted by 2 members of the project team and the SEND Inspector, as the parent did not attend). Interviews were held on the 4th April 2013. The 3 panel members judged 1 candidate as most suitable for the role based on the interview criteria, and references and a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check were taken up and found to be satisfactory.

The teacher formerly started work on the 15th April 2013 and undertook an induction process, which included an introduction to Cedar School (who were to provide supervisory/training support to SPECTRUM's teacher) via meetings and attendance at Open Days etc.

The teacher wrote this statement about her induction experience on the teacher questionnaire evaluation:

SPECTRUM specific induction: "The staff at Spectrum were very kind and welcoming, I felt like part of the team immediately especially by the core members of staff who were in regular email and phone contact with me. The aims and expectations of the project were clearly explained to me, so we were all working towards a common goal. We arranged a visit to see the child where I was supported by SPECTRUM staff which I was grateful for as I was nervous about visiting for the first time. I was given the flexibility to deliver a curriculum completely targeted at the individual child which has helped me develop my role as Home Tutor."

Cedar School induction: "SPECTRUM staff went out of their way to develop a relationship with Cedar School to ensure I would get the professional teaching support I needed. They arranged visits to the school and meetings with the school staff."

3.1.2 Parental Involvement in the project

SPECTRUM recognised that parental involvement (and child where possible) would be essential to the Person Centred nature of this project, and has placed this involvement as a main priority throughout and worked hard to achieve this ongoing engagement.

The parent was involved on the interview panel for the recruitment of the teacher, along with the SEND Inspector, and SPECTRUM project team member.

A meeting took place at the parent's home on Monday 15 April 2013; prior to the teacher starting her teaching role. This was an opportunity for all parties to ask questions and to generally get to know each other and establish how communications between all parties were to work (swapping phone numbers etc.).

The parent, who has work commitments, was intermittently present when the teacher was home educating the child. However, feedback

from an adult daughter and the parent when present about the child's teaching provision has always proved positive. The parent has asked SPECTRUM to continue support from 1 April 2014.

For the final report an interview with the parent took place in February 2014. The parent (carer) questionnaire based on the Think Local Act Personal (TLAP) markers formed the basis of the interview.

From project remit, what SPECTRUM was contracted to do:

“A decision will be made by SCC for the continuation of any ISF in the last 2 months of the pilot – dependent on the pilot findings and negotiation between all parties.”

In view of the above recommendation SPECTRUM considered whether it wished to continue the ISF in the last 2 months of the project. SPECTRUM consulted with its teacher and reviewed all aspects of the project (resources both staff and financial and the contract with Cedar School etc). Feedback though our teacher confirmed that the child/family wished the ISF to continue with SPECTRUM managing it. Our Development Worker at SCC confirmed that the Council were in agreement that the provision could continue from 1 April if the parent agreed. Further discussions with the parent took place on a home visit and the parent has subsequently signed a contract (based on outcomes from Think Local Act Personal markers of progress criteria), with SPECTRUM for the continuation of the ISF to provide a Personal Education Budget for a further year from 1 April 2014.

3.1.3 Recording of information

The project staff and SPECTRUM's teacher have all kept project diaries to identify in what areas of work/management they were spending their time.

The project team developed and worked to a project plan that was reviewed and updated as required.

3.1.4 Funding/Invoice/Payment Arrangements

SPECTRUM has been keeping a detailed record of all financial aspects of this project in accordance with managing and being accountable for an ISF and grant funding from Southampton City Council.

Funding for this project has been broken into two distinct areas:

- (1) To raise awareness and promote the availability of ISF in SEND, to evaluate and report on what is achieved, and to develop a 'step-by-step' guide at the end of the project (in Partnership with Mencap). This aspect of the project is funded by a grant from Southampton City Council for £5,130 covering the period 1st Jan 2013 to 31st March 2014, payable in 5 equal quarterly payments.
- (2) For, the one child we are supporting, the provision of an Individual Service Fund for children with Special Educational Needs who have a Personal Education Budget, payment is being received monthly on receipt of an invoice, split into 12 equal amounts. The parent is not making a client contribution therefore the full amount of the ISF budget is being invoiced monthly (payable in arrears) to the Directorate of Children's Services and Learning (OGS 4), Southampton City Council. The monthly amount is £1,716.91, totalling £20,602.87 for the 2013/2014 financial year.

SPECTRUM negotiated a 17.5% ISF management fee which is included in the monthly total of £1,716.91. This fee covered general management support, employment (of teacher) specific support, financial systems management and family liaison etc.

3.1.5 Materials Produced

All materials were produced in accessible formats:

SPECTRUM's organisational minimum standard for documents is Arial font 14. As standard, SPECTRUM also provides documents in other accessible formats on request. SPECTRUM believes that personalised services only work if all information is presented in a format that users can access and understand. The parent was provided with our standard format after establishing her access requirements (i.e. at recruitment, the interview documentation and contract of service).

The following materials were produced for the ISF:

3.1.5a Recruitment:

- (i) Job Description & Person Specification
- (ii) Recruitment advertisement
- (iii) Shortlisting questions and procedure

- (iv) Interview questions and procedure
- (v) Induction programme (standard SPECTRUM but amended)

3.1.5b Contracts - general:

- (i) Contract of service in place between Children Services (Education) and SPECTRUM
- (ii) Contract of employment in place with teacher.
- (iii) Contract of service between Spectrum and Cedar School; for the provision of supervision support, access to their standard training programme and facility to lend resources to facilitate a 'try-before-you-buy' arrangement for resources our teacher had needed to meet the child's educational needs.

3.1.5c Contracts – between child/family and SPECTRUM

- (i) Contract of service for the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014, was not signed by the parent due to a lack of access.
- (ii) Contract of service in place between parent and SPECTRUM for the continuation of the ISF from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.

The following materials were produced for the Demonstrator Project:

3.1.5d Promotion

- (i) Due to the issues already highlighted, no promotional resources or activities have been possible.

3.1.5e Contracts

- (i) Grant agreement in place between Southampton City Council and SPECTRUM for the additional requirements of the Demonstrator Project.

3.1.5f Evaluation materials – questionnaires

Three questionnaires were produced to establish the views / experiences of the child, parent and teacher.

- (i) Child questionnaire

Due to the age and access issues of the child it was not possible to complete the child questionnaire with the child regardless of method used.

Therefore, the child questionnaire was developed with educational achievement in mind with particular relevance to choice and control over learning style; the questions to be answered by the parent and teacher.

As above it was not possible to gain access to the parent for the completion of the questionnaire at the interim stage, and although the parent was interviewed at the final report stage the child questionnaire did not form part of the interview process with the parent due to practical constraints of the parent on the day.

SPECTRUM's teacher completed this questionnaire at both the interim and final report stages.

(ii) Parent (carer) questionnaire

The parent/carer questionnaire was based on the Think Local Act Personal (TLAP) markers. The TLAP markers were used as an evaluation tool for the parent questionnaire as the markers had been developed by people who used services to evaluate services so were a person-centred user-led evaluation tool.

Ideally, these questions could be used (revised in the future for easy access), to interview a child with their parent. As above it was not possible to access the parent for the completion of the questionnaire at the interim stage (various methods were used: telephone, written correspondence, using SPECTRUM's teacher to pass on messages via adult family member, asking the SEND Inspectors advice), but the questionnaire was completed for the final report stage assisted by the project team on a home visit.

(iii) Teacher questionnaire

The 'teacher' questionnaire was developed taking into account the professional and personal development needs of the teacher whilst on the project and looking to future career prospects. The methodology

used for completion of the questionnaire was for the teacher to complete unassisted.

The teacher was requested to record any issues she encountered in completing the questionnaire so that it could be developed for future use. The teacher reported that the questions were straightforward to answer but as she had not had any formal supervision this section was left unanswered at the interim report stage but was completed in full at the final report stage.

(For copies of the template questionnaires see appendix 1-3.)

3.2 Other Stakeholder Meetings

3.2.1 Education/School Meetings: Cedar School

Jonathan Howells, Head Teacher from Cedar School met with the project team and SPECTRUM's on several occasions during the course of the project. The project team were also in regular email contact. Jonathan Howells assisted with the evaluation by providing feedback evidence at interim and final report stages of the project.

A contract was agreed for the provision of supervisory, training and resource support to cover the period of this project. The service from Cedar School was agreed for a fixed fee of £2,000 per annum.

As the ISF was continuing after the term of the project, SPECTRUM approached Cedar School to ask for an extension to their service provision for a further year at the same fixed price; this has now been agreed.

There are potential implications for the future if SPECTRUM were to provide ISF support to more children/families receiving a Personal Education Budget, and the capacity of Cedar School to deliver on its current service would need to be established. If the demand was sufficient then there would be potential for SPECTRUM to provide it's own supervisory support in-house (i.e. employing a professional SEND teacher with supervisor/trainer experience rather than contracting out), but this would need further research to prove if it was cost efficient.

3.2.2 Other Health Practitioners

SPECTRUM's teacher has worked with the child's, Occupational Therapist and Physiotherapist. It has been beyond the remit of this project to establish the impact of the other health and social care professionals working with the child/family.

3.2.3 Specific service with customer (ISF)

SPECTRUM has been managing the ISF budget on the child/families behalf.

SPECTRUM has been keeping detailed financial records using it's accounting software. SPECTRUM set-up the ISF account as a totally separate department on its accounts system so that all income and expenditure could be easily identified and accounted for. Detailed account reports can be produced from this accounts system for review on demand. If more ISF's were to be managed then this system has the capacity to be scaled-up on the accounts system and SPECTRUM has experience of this with other projects/services it currently provides.

At the interim report stage in September 2013, the first 6 monthly accounts statement was posted to the parent (tried to set-up home visit in September 2013 to discuss accounts along with evaluation processes which proved unsuccessful).

During a home visit in February 2014, a financial report from the beginning of April 2013 projected to the end of March 2014 was provided to the parent. The report was discussed in some detail, which included how much money was received, how the money was managed as part of SPECTRUM's accounting procedures (see below for sample unpopulated financial report).

Sample of unpopulated financial report provided to the parent:

Item	Income	Expenditure	Balance
ISF Budget £1,716.91 per month			
Teacher salary (Plus			

NI/tax liabilities)			
Cedar School, supervisory support (£2,000 per annum)			
SPECTRUM Management Fee (17.5%)			
Additional expenditure (i.e. teacher recruitment advertisement, resources purchased etc.)			
Balance Remaining			

It was reported to the parent that there had been an under spend on the ISF for the financial year (1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014) and the parent was consulted on the use of the money. The parent requested that the under spend should be used to purchase i-Pad and specialist software which was identified as of educational value; this has now been purchased. A laptop for the teacher was also purchased at the parents request to facilitate the teacher's role.

It was agreed to 6 monthly accounts reports to the parent with a member of the project team offering to talk them through during a home visit, and access to the accounts was offered on request at other times on request.

3.2.4 Mencap – Step by step guide for providers

A series of meetings had taken place with Alex Iles, Manager of Mencap with SPECTRUM project staff to plan the jointly produced, step by step guide for providers which forms part of this project work. This will be available at the end of May 2014.

4. OUTCOMES

We decided to evaluate the project by using the Think Local Act Personal (TLAP) makers (4.1) developed by service users as we wanted the project to be evaluated using person centred criteria. There are 6 markers of progress: 1) Information and advice; 2) active and supportive communities; 3) flexible integrated care and support; 4) workforce; 5) risk assessment and; 6) Personal Budgets.

Secondly we decided to evaluate any culture change (4.2) in the working relationships between customers, providers and the local authority.

4.1 Outcomes against ‘Making It Real’ markers:

The following methodology was used to gather evidence:

- An interview at the final report stage with the parent by a member of the project team.
- Completion of evaluation questionnaires (see copies of template questionnaires in Appendix 1-3)
- Information provided from the parent to the teacher, during the project.

Note: All quotes cited below in speech marks are from the parent gathered using the above methodology.

4.1.1 Information & Advice: Having the information I need, when I need it.

Information to decide on ISF option and SPECTRUM as organisation:

The parent described the information they received prior to the commencement of the ISF as “*useful*” and “*perfect*” and that it “*could not be improved*”. The family reported that they were able to make an informed decision about using an ISF as a means to access home education provision for their child.

The parent reported that they were given enough information to establish that their ISF would be a “*straightforward option*”; in particular that it did not require them sourcing education/teaching services or employing a teacher directly which was important to them.

The parent reported that they had prior experience and enough information to conclude that SPECTRUM was the organisation they wanted working on their behalf managing their ISF. (Although this was the only option that was available and they were presented with. If this option had not been available there were no other viable alternatives for the family/parent to access education for their child at the time.)

The parent had already used SPECTRUM's advocacy service and experience of using SPECTRUM's peer support/advocacy service was an important consideration in the parent accepting SPECTRUM as their support organisation, "*SPECTRUM stands for people who cannot talk for themselves; they give a voice to my child.*"

In terms of the management of the ISF itself the parent reported they had enough information about SPECTRUM's role, the parent noted a key task of the service provision being: "*SPECTRUM with my approval manages the money, and takes the responsibility out of my hands.*"

The parent chose the ISF option as their perception of sourcing education/teaching services, or recruiting and interviewing a teacher on their own was that it was "*complicated*" and finding professional teachers who were SEND qualified as "*difficult for an individual.*"

The parent reported that she was a "*very busy person*" and did not "*want the responsibility of getting insurance etc.*", that came with an employee employment contract. "*It would have been a big responsibility and I already have too much responsibility.*"

4.1.2 Active & Supportive Communities: Has this initiative helped you maintain involvement with your friends, families and your community:

The parent noted that as a result of education being provided at home rather than no education being provided, this initiative "*..has allowed the family to do other things, me to work.*"

The whole point of home education for the parent was that the child was "*in a comfy place, a place that was known with people she knew*" (subsequently now including the teacher). As the parent described that the child was "*not comfortable with people she did not know*", and was "*a poorly girl whom benefited from staying inside*" (there had been 5 hospital admissions in the year).

The parent was aware of the role that Cedar School were playing such as providing education resources to 'try out' and supervisory/training support to the teacher, and had noted that in the future maybe her child could attend teaching sessions at this school when her child's health improved.

The parent was convinced that education provided in the home was the right choice for the child at the current time with a qualified SEND teacher providing this education, "*teacher playing with her is perfect teaching*".

4.1.3 Flexible integrated care and support: my support, my own way.

The parent noted that it was very easy to get information/support from the teacher and she knew that she could "*pop in for tea*" at SPECTRUM if she needed any assistance.

The parent reported that they never experienced or could identify any negative issues with the service received from SPECTRUM itself.

The parent noted that SPECTRUM's teacher and the ISF project team had assisted with multidisciplinary team liaison in health and social care and also between SPECTRUM's advocacy service. This bridged the gap between professionals accessed by the child and the family.

Previous experience of using main-stream educational services had reportedly proved negative with transport to the school and general support being quoted as issues by the parent.

The ISF provision and education in the home setting was reported by the parent as a service, "*....that met the needs of the child/family*", that "*provided flexible support*", and "*...included other professional input that worked together and the family were in control of.*" This was because the teacher was helping to liaise with the other professionals.

4.1.4 Workforce: My support staff.

The parent reported being very involved with the choice of teacher from a choice of 4 candidates, "... it was a good process. I went with my feelings; I knew the teacher was the right person from the beginning."

"At the start I had to offer advice on some education things for example child's likes and dislikes and how to hold the child correctly whilst being taught. I also joined in with some of the songs". But "the teacher is a professional and knows what she is doing."

The parent could not identify any issues with her child's teacher/teaching, both the approach and voicing her views about the teaching style.

4.1.5 Risk enablement: Feeling in control and safe.

The parent reported that her child was safe but if she had any problems she stated that "*I would go to a member of the project team or my Social Worker (for child) but there haven't been any problems*".

The child was still receiving support from the same number of other health and social care professionals but due to the ISF these were being co-ordinated more effectively according to the parent.

4.1.6 Personal Budgets: My money.

The parent reported that she was confident about where the money was spent during the year after being given and talked through a financial accounts statement.

The parent made choices about how to spend the remaining money at the end of the 12 month period (i-pad/specialist software and laptop for teacher).

Other quotes from the parent:

- *It's been an amazing experience.*
- *I am so pleased that this is happening.*
- *SPECTRUM are so very helpful.*
- *When I'm at work my child is safe and comfortable.*
- *The teacher is so good for my child, I would not change anything.*
- *The teacher "understands our home situation".*
- *Everything is in place.*

4.2 Any Culture Change in Relationships Between Customers, Provider and The Local Authority

4.2.1 Child/family and Education Department (quotes from SEN Inspector):

This had been the first time the SEND Inspector had interviewed with a parent sitting on the interview panel. The SEND Inspector noted that “... *this experience had influenced her views at a subsequent interview about what the parent would want from the teacher that was to be employed.*”

“The parent was more open to suggestions and was working more closely with other professionals as a result of the ISF education provision.”

4.2.2 SPECTRUM and Education Department (quotes from SEN Inspector):

The SEND Inspector noted that “*SPECTRUM had always listened to the implications of any actions suggested to them by her*”. That SPECTRUM’s approach “*had been creative in problem solving*”. SPECTRUM had an “*attitude of no barriers and instead looked for solutions*”; “*had been supportive of the process*”; “*had always had an enthusiastic approach to the project*”. The SEND Inspector noted that she had enjoyed working with SPECTRUM.

4.2.3 SPECTRUM and teaching profession (quotes from Jonathan Howell, Head of Cedar School):

“It has been a real pleasure to be involved with the SEND project and sharing professional support between SPECTRUM and the school. Utilising a personal budget seems very worthwhile.”

“The planning between Spectrum and the school has been good thus far and the contract set up between both providers has allowed professionalism and integrity with our particular working cultures but also much needed flexibility.”

4.2.4 Council and child/family/ and SPECTRUM:

“Due to the pilot being very small scale and limited to only involving a couple of council staff it has not led to any wider culture change.

However, I think the learning from this has influenced the thinking of those directly involved.” Development Worker, SCC.

4.2.5 SPECTRUM with child/family and Council Services:

“The project has benefited enormously from the expertise that SPECTRUM already had around personalisation and also from their willingness to trial a completely new area in SEND personal budgets delivered through an ISF.” Development Worker, SCC

5 BARRIERS AND SOLUTIONS

The evaluation reviewed the barriers it encountered and offered solutions to them. This is reported under 2 headings: 1) ISF specific (5.1) and; 2) Evaluation specific (5.2).

5.1 ISF specific:

- **Barrier:** Originally a Service Level Agreement was discussed as a potential option, however due to procurement regulations and policy this option could not be pursued in the required timescales,
 - **Solution:** It was decided that the alternative would be to pilot an ISF. This overcame the procurement obstacles, as in effect as an ISF operator we were receiving a personal budget on the parent's behalf.
- **Barrier:** Supporting children/families was a departure from SPECTRUM's normal business (adults).
 - **Solution:** The project staff had to spend time learning about service provision provided through children's services and their structures/processes and key contacts.
- **Barrier:** The use and purchase of teaching resources through the ISF, although discussed with the SEND Inspector was not formally included in the original proposal. An additional £100 was subsequently added to the personal budget by Children's Services and agreement from Cedar School was secured to loan any necessary available teaching resources. At the parent's request, i-pad and specialist software were purchased for the child through the ISF using the personal budget under spend.
 - **Solution:** There needs to be planned access to teaching resources and materials at the start and if not readily available to loan, then funds to purchase need to be identified/agreed upfront.
- **Barrier:** SPECTRUM was aware that there were specialist skills they did not possess such as supervising a teacher.
 - **Solution:** Supervision support funding was discussed and agreed with education/SEND from the start of the ISF. As a result it was agreed by education to include it as part of the ISF funding package. Therefore, using the personal budget, and

after receiving advice from the SEND Inspector about the most appropriate supervising provider, the SEND Inspector/SPECTRUM approached Cedar School for supervisory support/training provisions for our teacher due to their professional expertise and as a partnership working exercise. This cost (£2,000 per annum) was budgeted for in the original proposal as noted above. It is worth pointing out that only qualified teachers can supervise other teachers.

- **Barrier:** Although SPECTRUM has not found sourcing supervisory support a barrier with only 1 child and 1 teacher, if the need for the service was increased with more children and teachers sustainability and operating on a larger scale would need to be considered.
 - **Solution:** Providers would need to consider whether employing an HR education supervisor was economically feasible or some sort of consortium set-up who employed a teacher supervisor between them? If the marketplace/demand was big enough then teachers could potentially set up as consultant teacher supervisors.
- **Barrier:** SPECTRUM also needed access to professional knowledge specific to providing education provision to carry out this work.
 - **Solution:** Working with the SEND Inspector in co-production ensured we familiarised ourselves with the National Curriculum, and professional educational qualifications to recruit/manage a teacher. Without this support gaining this knowledge would have been problematic.
- **Barrier:** Having a signed contract of service in place.
 - **Solution:** Prepare the contract child/family contract agreement in advance and then getting access to the parent to sign it needed to have been carried out before the ISF started as gaining access to the parent later was problematic.
- **Barrier:** The educational academic year for planning purposes in general i.e. access to SPECTRUM's teacher, the SEND Inspector, and the teaching profession in general.
 - **Solution:** By using a PB there is potential for more flexible working with the budget holder controlling the frequency of teaching during the year. Therefore practices could be adapted to suit the child/family under this provision providing a

personalised service rather than a service based on local authority or education parameters.

5.2 Evaluation Specific

- **Barrier:** Lack of referrals to the project did not give us the opportunity to compare and contrast different ISF provision with only 1 referral to the project from SEND.
 - **Solution:** SEND needed to establish their ability to provide referrals to the project for the viability of the evaluation.

- **Barrier:** The way that educational services operated caused delays in carrying out the evaluation process due to a lack of immediate access to SPECTRUM's teacher, SEND Inspector and Head of Cedar School i.e. whilst schools were on holiday when drafting the interim and final reports.
 - **Solution:** More flexible working from all parties. But all educational stakeholders including SPECTRUM's teacher did provide feedback when they were actually on leave but this could not be guaranteed for future providers.

- **Barrier:** The evaluation questionnaires were not available from day 1 of the project so a baseline assessment was not possible.
 - **Solution:** Questionnaires needed to be available at the start of the project. However, there was a lot of available evidence i.e. the child was not receiving any education prior to the commencement of the ISF to evidence our initial involvement.

- **Barrier:** SPECTRUM found gaining access to the parent a major barrier to carrying out the project evaluation at the interim stage.
 - **Solution:** Needed to be clearer with the parent about the importance of the evaluation process. In comparison accessing the parent for interview for the final report was very straightforward. The parent was aware that a contract for the continuation of the service was to be discussed at this meeting. However, the project team has gained reasonable access in light of the families "hard to reach" label. With our teacher only

not accessing the child without explanation once in the entire year.

6 FINANCE STATEMENT

The funding for this demonstration project came from two sources, reflecting the requirements to:

- (1) Measure and evaluate the benefits or dis-benefits of using an ISF to deliver education services. This was provided by a 15 month grant from Southampton City Council
- (2) The provision and management of the ISF itself. This was provided by a fixed percentage 'Management Fee', added on top of the Personal Budget

6.1 Grant to measure and evaluate the benefits; dis-benefits of using an ISF to deliver education services:

The following chart shows how actual expenditure differed from that projected in the grant proposal, together with reasons for any differences.

Activity	Projected	Actual	Reason
Consultation / briefing/ training sessions. (customers, carers, staff and vols inc. data collection)	£480	£166	Advised against briefing consulting and training activities
Additional start-up resources (information materials, IT software etc)	£1000	£800	Recruitment costs not budgeted & Accounts system upgrade
Customer / Carer Surveys x 3	£1210	£1056	Less than projected due to only one user
Evaluation Reports x 2	£825	£1386	Finalisation time estimated. Both reports took

			more time than budgeted
Production of Step by Step Guide jointly with Mencap on creating ISFs for other providers	£770	£750	Estimated as not due till end May 2014
20% uplift Project Management Costs for ISF Evaluation (not covered by contract for SEND service provision)	£ 430	£728	Set-up and familiarisation time was underestimated at start of project
Cost analysis of activity to create and implement ISF	£415	£350	Estimated costs in systems set-up
Total	£5,130	£5,236	

6.2 Management Fee for provision and management of the ISF

Our demonstration project also tested the costing premise of charging a fixed percentage 'up-lift' of the Personal Budget to provide adequate funds for the provision and management of an ISF service.

For the purposes of the demonstration we agreed a fixed uplift of 17.5% on top of the agreed Personal Budget, to be invoiced on a monthly basis. The 17.5% we agreed based on SPECTRUM's previous experience in managing Personal Budgets in other areas.

SPECTRUM's monthly 'Management Fee' on this basis was £255.71 (£3,068 for a 12 month period)

This Management Fee covered the costs of providing the following functions:

- Project Management & Governance
- Service user liaison, reporting and review

- Staff management, problem solving & guidance
- Complaints, grievances and conflict resolution
- Cover costs in event of sickness, pregnancy, staff replacement (i.e. recruitment)
- Financial recordkeeping, invoices, expenses and reporting
- Office costs
- Insurance
- Legal and professional costs

In SPECTRUM's experience, a 17.5% Management Fees is enough to meet these costs, IF the organisation is providing this function for 5 or more service users.

In the event of an organisation providing less than 5 packages of support (as we did in this project) then there is a significant organisational risk in estimating costs simply because it is impossible to predict on a case by case basis how much HR input, sickness and pregnancy cover etc. might be needed.

Whilst only a minority of packages will experience these costs, if an organisation is managing 5 or more packages then these risks and costs can be mitigated by averaging across all packages.

For SPECTRUM, managing just this one package, we were lucky and we did not experience any of these cost risks in year 1.

However, we know from experience that this 'luck' is not a given and in our view it is only by managing multiple packages that these cost risks can be adequately mitigated.

6.3 Cost Effectiveness of an ISF:

The cost effectiveness of an ISF can only be evaluated when compared with potential alternatives:

- **Service User/Family receiving a Direct Payment or Personal Budget:** In this situation the service users/family member will take on the management function which would remove the need for paying an ISF Provider. However, it is recognised that not every service user/family is willing, or in some cases able, to take on

these responsibilities. For example our parent did not wish to employ and be responsible for a teacher's recruitment and supervising. Although a parent could have contracted with a supervision provider as SPECTRUM subsequently did. In the event of package breakdown, or fluctuating capacity the remedial costs (to the Council) can be considerable.

- **The Council providing the service:** The Council must fully analysis the cost factors identified above when considering the cost of an ISF when compared to that of a comparable Council provided service.

Consideration should also be made to the effectiveness and potentially better outcomes of an ISF (as demonstrated in this report) when compared to a Council service; particularly in respect to the outcomes realisable from the service user/family having more choice and control over how their needs are met.

SPECTRUM's experience of providing Direct Payments and Personal Budget services for many years suggests that a proper analysis of these factors will demonstrate a Direct Payment to be the most cost effective, followed by an ISF.

6.4 Economies of scale

SPECTRUM's experience shows that cost savings in the Management Fees charged may be possible when the quantity of packages exceed 10 reasonably sized packages. (Management fee reductions to 16.5% to a minimum of 15% may be possible depending on scale and complexity of package)

Due to the cost risks identified above, organisations that manage less than 5 packages should either charge a higher percentage Management Fee or seek to agree with the Council a contingency fee that can be drawn on in the event of unexpected costs.

Please note: these percentages are quoted on a non-profit basis, they are unlikely to be viable in a commercial setting where companies need to make a profit.

7 CONCLUSIONS

The project went well in terms of the ISF delivered as a Person Education Budget delivering a personalised service to a child who had previously been receiving no education at all. Engagement with the parent to undertake the evaluation process was problematic but access to the child for teaching was always consistent.

Not having our 2 to 5 customer base hampered the evaluation process in terms of having users to compare and contrast, also our claims to be representative in our conclusions.

The aims were met or partially met:

- Customer choice and control over service provision and delivery was demonstrated for our customer.
- Customer (and Carers) satisfaction was demonstrated with very positive feedback from our parent on the delivery of service.
- Impact on transition was not appropriate to this project.
- Culture change in relationships between customers, providers and the local authority was partially demonstrated in terms of some progress being made i.e. parent on recruitment panel and ULO organisation working with education. But this aim needs more testing.
- Cost effectiveness, this needs further research as it can only be evaluated if compared to other potential alternatives and the council needs to analysis cost factors of an ISF when compared to that of a comparable Council provided service. But potential better outcomes need to be taken into account as a factor as well.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Service user engagement & involvement – choice and control

Involve the user in all aspects of service planning, delivery and on-going assessment of the service to provide a truly personalised service with the user at the centre of this service.

Consider new ways of working to achieve better outcomes for the user i.e. the parent on the interview panel although a departure from standard educational procedure was crucial for the success of the project especially as the teacher was providing the service in the user's home environment.

Ensure all contractual agreements are available and signed off in a timely fashion by user and provider before service users are taken on so that the rights and responsibilities of user and provider are clearly identified.

Ensure the user is made aware of the importance of certain accountability functions supplied by the provider i.e. financial accounting and where their money is being spent on their behalf.

8.2 Collaborative working with other health and social care professionals and non-service providers

Multidisciplinary working is essential to working in a personalised, holistic way and the ISF should not operate in a vacuum from other health and social care professionals supporting the user. Any non-service options should be taken into account for completeness.

Do not consider not having all the skills necessary for the delivery of every aspect of the service as a barrier to undertaking the work as working in collaboration with 'expert' providers like the SEND Inspector and Cedar School added value to the project rather than protracted from it.

Ensure all stakeholders are signed up to the process; the minimum level of referrals (2-5) onto the project was not reached as a result of educational department/political issues that were out of SPECTRUM's control and affected our evaluation processes in terms of being representative.

Consider the culture and working practice of professionals working on behalf of the family so that they can co-ordinate their efforts to provide effective service delivery i.e. SPECTRUM has maintained regular contact with the child and family which the educational and other professional departments have found problematic in terms of their engagement.

8.3 Management of ISF delivered as a PB

It is very important that the user is fully involved with the management of the money and understands about the income and expenditure of their budget. Although our parent was initially not that interested in the financial systems in place to manage the ISF budget at the start of the project, SPECTRUM engaged her involvement to the extent that she made decisions about under spent monies by the end of the project term and requested 6 monthly statements of accounts.

That the provider has fully transparent and accessible (via the user) financial systems in place to manage the ISF budget. This includes the ISF being separately recorded on the accounts system from other organisational monies.

To work towards the user directing the provider to work in spending the budget in a sustainable way i.e. purchase of i-pad and specialist software for continued educational development.

8.4 Provider role

Use those providers such as SPECTRUM who work to and are experienced in Independent Living philosophies and the Social Model to deliver a truly personalised service.

8.5 Service provision

The user and family should be at the centre of all decision making about the service delivery, actively involved with it's design and delivery and continued monitoring and evaluation.

That quality, timely up to date and fully accessible information both written and verbal and electronic where appropriate, should be available to the user of the service so that they can continue to make informed choices about the support they receive and how they receive it.

Fully flexible support needs to be geared to the user of the service; the “pop in for tea” approach was valued by our service user.

That evaluation of services are undertaken using tools and methods that measure outcomes from the users perspective so the outcomes are person centred rather than provider centred.

Communication pathways between user and provider need to be considered to ensure effective working.

APPENDIX 1:

Parent Questionnaire

SPECTRUM is an organisation run by, and for, Disabled People; believing that everybody has the right to achieve full participation in all spheres of society, and make changes to how they are viewed and treated.

This is a one-off “Demonstrator” project to explore the introduction of an Individual Service Fund (ISF) as a delivery mechanism to facilitate personalisation in Adult Social Care. Two Organisations are involved in the “Demonstrator” - Southampton Mencap and SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living. Both Organisations will be helping Southampton City Council to explore different models of an ISF to enable a full “compare and contrast” evaluation.)

SPECTRUM will develop and deliver an ISF “offer” to individual customers of Southampton Children Services, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND).

Thank you for answering these questions.

If you do not want to answer all the questions we would still be pleased to receive your other answers.

Please indicate where questions are not applicable to you.

All written information is available, on request, in larger print, Braille, on audiotape or computer disc.



Large Print



Any information that you give will be treated confidentially

Information & Advice: Did you have the information you needed, at the time you needed it?:

1. Where did you hear about SPECTRUM's PB/ISF Initiative?
2. How helpful was the information you received? How could we improve this information for the future?
3. Do you have all the information and advice you need to feel in control, to feel empowered and to make the best choices for you and your child? How could it be improved?
4. What alternative options did you consider before agreeing to become involved with SPECTRUM's ISF initiative?
5. Why did you decide to become involved in SPECTRUM's initiative?
6. Was SPECTRUM's role properly explained to you? What do you understand SPECTRUM's role to be?
7. Were you made aware that this ISF pilot finishes on 31st March 2014 and therefore SPECTRUM's support and money management role cannot be guaranteed after this date?

Active & Supportive Communities: Has this initiative helped you maintain involvement with your friends, families and your community:

8. How well has your PB/ISF and the support you receive from SPECTRUM enabled you and your family to be more involved in your friends, families and your community?
9. If you have been involved in a self-help network with other families with similar experiences and needs to you, how have they helped you?
10. How much, if any, do you feel your opportunities have been improved by your PB/ISF?
11. How has an ISF impacted on your child's education and welfare? (e.g. choice and control, improved ability for your child to be involved with friends, family and their community)

12. Does the family or child feel more empowered to make choices or be in control by your support from SPECTRUM and its ethos to provide choice and control?
13. Would you say that the nature of your relationship has changed concerning the provision of your child's educational services? If Yes, how?

Flexible integrated care and support: Is the Support you receive from SPECTRUM meet your needs and expectations, and does it enable your child's education to be more flexible and more under your control than the services you have received in the past:

14. How easy was the process of applying for a PB/ISF? What could have been better?
15. How well were you supported by SPECTRUM with the process of applying for a PB/ISF?
16. How long did you have to wait to receive your PB/ISF from the date of you decide you wanted it?

Using your PB/ISF

17. How easy is it to obtain information or support from SPECTRUM when you need it?
18. Did the support from SPECTRUM resolve all the issues you had (give examples)?
19. How well has SPECTRUM supported you with any concerns or problems you have experienced?
20. How confident did you feel about your child's education before SPECTRUM?
21. How confident do you now feel about your child's education now you are using PB/ISF?
22. Overall, would you say your PB/ISF suits you and your child?

23. Do you feel in control of planning how it your PB/ISF is used? If not, why?
24. Is the support you receive from SPECTRUM helpful in enabling you to direct how your PB/ISF is used?

Workforce: Questions about your teacher/support staff:

Recruiting your support staff:

25. How involved did you feel with choosing your teaching and/or support staff? What else would you have wanted?
26. How easy was it to recruit the teacher or obtain the other support you needed to suit your child's needs and your wishes?
27. How much say do you feel you have in what your teaching / support staff actually do and how they do it?
28. Do you receive any support or advice you need from SPECTRUM to help you manage any problems you have with your teaching/support staff?
29. Do you feel the people who teach/support your child have the rights skills and approach? What could be improved?
30. How do you ensure your teacher / support staff understand your wishes and opinions and those of your child?

Risk management/enablement: Do you feel in control and safe:

31. How safe do you and your child feel with your support arrangements?
32. Do you feel in control of how you would manage any risks or crisis if they developed unexpectedly?
33. Do you feel there are systems in place to minimise risks, without being intrusive in you or your child's life?

34. Where would you go to obtain support or advice in the event of concerns in respect of risks or crisis?

Personal Budget management: Managing your child's personal budget:

35. Do you know what your PB is and what it is being spent on?
36. Do you feel properly involved in decisions about how your PB is spent?
37. If you wanted to, do you feel able to be in control of changing how your PB should be spent?
38. What do you consider SPECTRUM's role to be in supporting you to decide the best way of planning your child's support needs?
39. What control / choice did you feel you had in any decisions about your child's education service prior to you receiving a PB?
40. What control / choice did you feel you have now?
41. How do you exercise this choice and control?

Please explain in your own words, what differences your PB made to you, your family and your child's lives,
Compared to what it was like before:

Any other comments:

Please make any further comments if you wish: Please be as honest as you can.

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire.

Please return it in the FREEPOST envelope to: Lesley Long-Price

SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living

FREEPOST (RLTK-XECG-JEJG)

UNITY 12

9-19 ROSE ROAD

SOUTHAMPTON SO14 6TE

Telephone: 023 8020 2635

Minicom: 023 8020 2649

Fax: 023 8020 2945

E-mail: Lesley.Long-Price@spectrumcil.co.uk

Web: [www. Spectrumcil.co.uk](http://www.Spectrumcil.co.uk)

Child Questionnaire/completion by parent/carer

SPECTRUM is an organisation run by, and for, Disabled People; believing that everybody has the right to achieve full participation in all spheres of society, and make changes to how they are viewed and treated.

This is a one-off “Demonstrator” project to explore the introduction of an Individual Service Fund (ISF) as a delivery mechanism to facilitate personalisation in Adult Social Care. Two Organisations are involved in the “Demonstrator” - Southampton Mencap and SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living. Both Organisations will be helping Southampton City Council to explore different models of an ISF to enable a full “compare and contrast” evaluation.)

SPECTRUM will develop and deliver an ISF “offer” to individual customers of Southampton Children Services, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND).

Thank you for answering these questions.

If you do not want to answer all the questions we would still be pleased to receive your other answers.

Please indicate where questions are not applicable to you.

All written information is available, on request, in larger print, Braille, on audiotape or computer disc.



Large Print



Any information that you give will be treated confidentially

Firstly, relationship with your teacher?

1. Have you a confident and trusting relationship with your teacher?

Yes

No

Any comments:

2. Did you feel you could ask questions/or make your wishes known?
3. Any more comments about your relationship with your teacher?

Learning Opportunities/Progress

4. Do you look forward to your teaching sessions?
5. What learning opportunities have been provided to you?
6. Were there any things you wanted to learn about that you did not get the opportunity?

Yes

No

Any comments:

7. Did being taught at home impact on your learning experience i.e. not being in a school environment with other children?

Yes

No

Any comments:

8. Any further comments?

Choice and Control

9. Do you get to choose what you learn and how you learn it?
10. Are you able to communicate to your teacher what your wishes are and be listened to?
11. Did you feel actively involved with your learning?

Resources

11. Did you have access to the teaching resources that you require?
Yes No

If 'Yes', please describe:

If 'no', what resources did you not have?:

Next Steps

12. What do you hope to be doing in a few years time (continue with current home tutoring role, etc)?

Please explain:

13. Any other comments?

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire.

Please return it in the FREEPOST envelope to: Lesley Long-Price

SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living

FREEPOST (RLTK-XECG-JEJG)

UNITY 12

9-19 ROSE ROAD

SOUTHAMPTON SO14 6TE

Telephone: (023) 8020 2635

Minicom: (023) 8020 2649

Fax: (023) 8020 2945

E-mail: Lesley.Long-Price@spectrumcil.co.uk

Web: www.Spectrumcil.co.uk

Teacher Questionnaire

SPECTRUM is an organisation run by, and for, Disabled People; believing that everybody has the right to achieve full participation in all spheres of society, and make changes to how they are viewed and treated.

This is a one-off “Demonstrator” project to explore the introduction of an Individual Service Fund (ISF) as a delivery mechanism to facilitate personalisation in Adult Social Care. Two Organisations are involved in the “Demonstrator” - Southampton Mencap and SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living. Both Organisations will be helping Southampton City Council to explore different models of an ISF to enable a full “compare and contrast” evaluation.)

SPECTRUM will develop and deliver an ISF “offer” to individual customers of Southampton Children Services, Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND).

Thank you for answering these questions.

If you do not want to answer all the questions we would still be pleased to receive your other answers.

Please indicate where questions are not applicable to you.

All written information is available, on request, in larger print, Braille, on audiotape or computer disc.



Large Print



Any information that you give will be treated confidentially

Firstly, how did you find working with SPECTRUM?

1. Please comment on your overall recruitment experience?
2. How did you find your induction into SPECTRUM and your learning of your role as Home Tutor?
3. What meetings did SPECTRUM include you in, was the contact with SPECTRUM too much or too little?
4. Did you feel part of the team?
5. How did SPECTRUM support you in your overall role?
6. What could SPECTRUM have done to improve your overall support?
7. Any more comments about your experience of SPECTRUM?

Supervision

8. Please comment on your experience of supervision?
9. Did you feel affectively supported on a day to basis as a result?
10. What could have been improved?
11. Did you find lone working as a home tutor, a positive or negative experience?
12. Did lone working impact on your professional development i.e. not being in a school environment?

Yes

No

Any comments:

13. Any further comments about supervision or loan working?

Training

14. Please outline what training or development you undertook?
 - a) at SPECTRUM
 - b) at Cedar School
15. How did the training impact on your professional development as a teacher
16. What could have been improved?

Resources

17. Did you have access to teaching resources that you required?
Yes No

If 'Yes', please describe:

If 'no', what resources did you not have?:

Next Steps

18. What do you hope to be doing in a few years time (continue with current home tutoring role, etc)?

Please explain:

19. Any other comments?

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire.

SPECTRUM Centre for Independent Living

FREEPOST (RLTK-XECG-JEJG)

UNITY 12

9-19 ROSE ROAD

SOUTHAMPTON SO14 6TE

Telephone: (023) 8033 0982

Minicom: (023) 8020 2649

Fax: (023) 8020 2945

E-mail: Lesley.Long-Price@spectrumcil.co.uk

Web: www.Spectrumcil.co.uk



Telephone:
(023) 8033 0982



Minicom:
(023) 8020 2649



Fax:
(023) 8020 2945



Address:
**SPECTRUM, Unity 12, 9-19 Rose
Road, Southampton SO14 6TE**



E-mail:
info@SpectrumCIL.co.uk



Website:
www.SpectrumCIL.co.uk



Blog:
www.SpectrumCIL.wordpress.com



Facebook
www.facebook.com/Spectrum.CIL

Twitter:
Twitter.com/SpectrumCIL