

## Appendix Two - Evaluation of the options for SDC and WDC

The information in the table below provides a summary description of three options identified for the permanent delivery model of home adaptations and improvements. Each of the options has been assessed against key criteria with regards to:

- Performance
- Customer experience / quality of service
- Capital and revenue costs
- Resilience of the service
- Influence/Control

### Options Evaluation for future delivery of home adaptations (including Disabled Facilities Grants) and improvements

	<b>Option 1 County Wide Shared Service - HEART</b>	<b>Option 2 South HAT Shared service (WDC / SDC)</b>	<b>Option 3 Pre-HAT service</b>
<b>Summary description</b>	Shared Service delivering range of interventions; holistic approach to home adaptations and improvements  Five year Partnership Agreement, with potential for Joint Committee	Shared service delivering range of interventions; holistic approach to home adaptations and improvements  Similar to Option1 but for South of County only.	WDC return to pre pilot Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) service.  WDC and Stratford District Council (SDC) dissolve partnership arrangements  Return to two stage service (County Council assessment passed to District Council for grant process)
<b>Proposed host</b>	Hosted by Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council (NBBC)	Hosted by Warwick District Council (WDC)	WDC and SDC deliver own service independently

<b>Staffing structure and arrangements</b>	<p>See Appendix 5</p> <p>WDC funds 1 x Housing Assessment Officer post</p> <p>Staff seconded to host (NBBC) initially for two years</p>	<p>Employment of staff to be agreed</p> <p>Staff employed by WDC (excluding County Staff) and costs sharing arrangement with SDC. (Proposed)</p> <p>WDC Staff:  1 x South HAT Manager  1 x Technical Officer  2 x Housing Assessment Officer</p> <p>WCC Staff:  Senior Occupational Therapist  4 x Occupational Therapists (OT)  2 x Housing Assessment Officer</p>	<p>Each authority employs own staff</p> <p>1 x Senior Grants Officer  1 x Grants Officer  1 x Admin Support  1 x Occupational Therapist (part time)</p>
<b>Financial impact - revenue costs for WDC</b>	<p>£33,090 (2016/17)</p>	<p>£12,575</p> <p>= £100,075 Minus fee income of £87.5k (12.5% of £700k)</p>	<p>£5,779</p> <p>£93,279 Minus fee income of £87.5k (12.5% of £700k)</p>
<b>Performance</b>  End to end times and Stage times	<p>High</p> <p>Assumption – based on North and South HAT performance trends</p> <p>Staffing structure provides single line management</p>	<p>High</p> <p>Assume continuation of improved performance</p>	<p>Low</p> <p>Process would need to accommodate time consuming handoffs, leading to delays</p>

<p><b>Quality of Service / Customer Experience</b></p>	<p>High</p> <p>Holistic service, capable of delivering range of interventions to meet customer needs.</p> <p>No hand-offs to other organisations. Customer has single point of contact for duration of their case.</p> <p>Assume continued improvement with Satisfaction levels as learning and improvement continues</p> <p>Assumes improved quality of work (adaptation work) as relationships grow with contractors</p>	<p>High</p> <p>As per comments for Option 1.</p>	<p>Moderate - Low</p> <p>Requirement for customers to deal with separate services; Warwickshire County Council (WCC) OTs and District Council Grant officers.</p> <p>Organisational handoffs (customers passed to different orgs) leading to delays and inefficient processes.</p>
<p><b>Capital (Better Care Fund) implications for WDC</b></p>	<p>Service designed to deliver rather of holistic / preventative services.</p> <p>This is in line with Better Care Fund (BCF) requirements</p>	<p>There are potential risks to accessing BCF as the alternative options have reduced capacity to deliver the full range of holistic, preventative services.</p>	<p>There are potential risks to accessing BCF as the alternative options have reduced capacity to deliver the full range of holistic, preventative services.</p>
<p><b>Resilience</b></p>	<p>Very High</p> <p>High resilience due to greater number of caseworkers in a County Wide service</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Very Low</p> <p>Low level of resilience assuming return to Pre-HAT levels of staffing in SDC and WDC</p>

<b>Influence/Control</b>	<p>Moderate</p> <p>Reduced influence / control for individual partner organisations due to implications of operating as part of a six partner shared service</p>	<p>High</p> <p>Service Delivery No change in influence or control of service delivery as with current pilot arrangements</p>	<p>Moderate</p> <p>High level of control of grant administration side of service.  Low level of control of OT assessments</p>
--------------------------	--	--	---

<p><b>Advantages</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance: Service Model (through HAT pilots) is well tested and proven to deliver significantly improved services for customers</li> <li>• Single line management of service</li> <li>• Customer experience: HEART caseworkers are skilled to offer wide range of interventions to support customer independence; customers able to deal with one point of contact</li> <li>• Resilience: offers high levels of resilience in the event of staff absence</li> <li>• Staffing resources: service is well resourced, skills and expertise available within the team (e.g. contractor management, technical knowledge) to provide quality service</li> <li>• Limited requirement for WDC to provide support services for the service</li> <li>• Consistent service delivered across County</li> <li>• HEART project well progressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance: Significantly improved performance, as demonstrated by the pilot service</li> <li>• Customer experience: Caseworkers skilled and competent to deliver wider range of interventions</li> <li>• High level of control of service</li> <li>• Good levels of resilience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of control and influence</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---	--	---

<p><b>Disadvantages/ Risks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for reduced control of service. However, the partnership agreement and proposed joint committee arrangements will provide protection for individual members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently there is uncertainty about potential arrangements for accessing County Council OT assessments of customer needs were Options 2 or 3 to be favoured by WDC. This represents a risk to the feasibility of these options.</li> <li>• Potential difficulties if single line management does not include OT's.</li> <li>• Potential for inconsistent service developing within Warwickshire</li> <li>• Greater requirement for WDC to resource support services for service</li> <li>• Requirement for substantial work to be undertaken to implement this option</li> <li>• The guidance on the Better Care Fund (BCF), which includes DFG funding, is clear there should be joint plan between all Better Care Fund partners on its usage. There are potential risks to accessing this funding if WDC does not enter the County wide HEART service as the alternative options have reduced capacity to deliver the full range of holistic, preventative services offered by Option 1.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently there is uncertainty about potential arrangements for accessing County Council OT assessments of customer needs were Options 2 or 3 to be favoured by WDC. This represents a risk to the feasibility of these options.</li> <li>• Performance: service performance deteriorates due to return to two stage process (slower response and end to end times)</li> <li>• Low levels of resilience in the event of staff absence</li> <li>• Customer experience: requirement to deal with multiple organisations (District and County Councils). No single point of contact</li> <li>• Range of interventions is more limited compared to Option 1 or 2.</li> <li>• Lack of consistent service model within Warwickshire</li> <li>• Requirement for WDC to resource all support services for service</li> <li>• The guidance on the Better Care Fund (BCF), which now includes DFG funding, is clear there should be joint plan between all Better Care Fund partners on its usage. There are potential risks to accessing this funding if WDC does not enter the County wide HEART service as the alternative options have reduced capacity to deliver the full range of holistic, preventative services.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---