

## Appendix 3

### Consultation of the transfer of SPFT Shared Lives to Brighton & Hove Shared Lives (In-house)

Following permission granted by Committee on the 20<sup>th</sup> of January 2014. Relevant stakeholders were consulted about the proposed transfer of SPFT Shared Lives.

#### Methodology

Consultation begun on the 10<sup>th</sup> of February 2014 for 12 weeks, concluding on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2014 and it followed guidance from the Community Engagement Framework.

Stakeholders consulted were: SPFT Shared Lives Carers (6 x carer), SPFT Shared Lives Service Users (16 x service user), staff at SPFT Shared Lives (1 x manager and 1 x Shared Lives officer) and staff at the In-House scheme (1 x manager and 3 x Shared Lives officer).

During the consultation, gathering of relevant quantitative and qualitative data took place using the following techniques: questionnaires to carers, service users and to the staff of both the SPFT Shared Lives and the In-House schemes; semi-structured individual interviews with each carer and service user; different focus groups with Shared Lives officers, carers and with service users; and feedback sessions to stakeholders.

Consultation schedule      —————>      See Appendix 4

#### ▼ Service users

Consultation to service users took place through written questions and individual and group meetings. The possibility of a focus group was declined by most of service users, this was therefore cancelled

A letter with information regarding the transfer and a number of written questions was handed to each service user in person. The text of the letter was edited by SPFT Shared Lives staff in order to free it from any jargon or element that could make its comprehension difficult. A pre-paid envelop was enclosed within each letter to facilitate service users posting his answers and/or any other thoughts regarding the transfer. 5 service users communicated their views on writing.

Individual and group meetings took place in each of the 6 Shared Lives family units In some units it was decided to have only a group meeting as individual meetings could trigger anxiety on service uses. 3 service users decided not to engage at any stage of the Consultation

When service users chose not to participate on the consultation it was agreed they would have the opportunity to express their thoughts via their carer or via a letter if they wished to do so.

When relevant and following service users' wishes, a letter explaining the proposed transfer of SPFT Shared Lives was sent to their family / advocate.

Sample letter to service users —————> See Appendix 5

Sample letter to relatives —————> See Appendix 5

#### ∇ **Carers**

SPFT Shared Lives carers were informed of the proposed transfer in person (by a Shared Lives officer) and consulted via questions in a letter, individual meetings and a focus group session. Overall written feedback with a summary of points discussed and agreed was sent to each carer after the focus group session

SPFT Shared Lives carers received a letter with a set of attached questions and a pre-paid envelop to send their answers. 2 carers responded in writing to the questions posed, 4 chose not to use this method.

Letter and questions to carers —————> See Appendix 5

Each of the 6 Shared Lives carers was met individually at their homes. In one occasion a secondary carer joined the meeting. Meetings lasted an average of an hour and a half.

Discussions were based on the previous set of questions sent to carers, exchange of information and the sharing of opinions regarding the proposed transfer. Following individual meetings, a focus group session was arranged with all carers.

A letter with feedback obtained following the focus group was sent to each carer.

#### ∇ **SPFT and In-House Shared Lives staff**

Both schemes were consulted via individual meetings, group/focus meetings with each scheme, and a group/focus meeting with both schemes together. Some of the staff members in both schemes chose to communicate their individual views via email rather than in one to one interviews

## **Feedback**

#### ∇ **Service Users**

Service users' main concern was the stability and continuity of their current placement and of their benefits. Change in the management of the scheme was of interest to them as long as it could affect their day to day life.

No obstacles/ issues for the transfer were highlighted by any service user and no comments or ideas to facilitate it were expressed

#### ∇ **Carers**

Information gathered from carers is divided in the two sections below: 'Views on the transfer' and 'Concerns expressed'

### Views on the transfer:

**The overall analysis stated by each carer was positive.**

**The transfer was perceived as an acknowledgment to the carers' work and to the intrinsic value of Shared Lives.**

Carers were aware the Council is intending to grow Shared Lives in the city and they affirmed feeling thrilled about being part of it. Carers stated they are looking forwards to the possibility of making a positive contribution to the In-House scheme. They would like to meet the In-House carers and officers, learn about their experience with Shared Lives and at the same time share their own knowledge with them.

### **Fees and Income**

SPFT Shared Lives carers were informed the proposal to transfer to the In-House scheme will include a clause regarding fees. This clause will state carers will continue being paid the same amount they currently receive for two years after the transfer takes place.

During this time service users' needs will be reviewed after which they will be allocated to their corresponding banding. After two years, SPFT SL carers will be paid following the banding system. This might mean more or less income depending on each case

The above will be only applied to current service users. Any new service user will be allocated within the In-House banding system.

Carers were positive about this. One carer stated this would allow an accurate reflection - on monetary terms - of the complexity of service users

At the moment SPFT carers receive a unique amount per service user. This view was shared and agreed by all other carers during the focus group session

### **Professional and personal development**

Two of the carers expressed their view of the transfer as an opportunity for their professional and personal development.

### Concerns expressed:

#### **How will I be supported?**

All SPFT SL carers expressed concerns about the support they would receive during and after the transfer of the scheme.

During the focus group carers discussed that if the transfer is agreed it would be convenient to arrange a group presentation with the In-House staff and this to be followed by individual introduction meetings with allocated Shared Lives officers. A final carer review with both the allocated SPFT and the new In-House Shared Lives Officers would also take place before the transfer.

During consultation it was discussed that there would be a transfer period of 3-4 months in which SPFT Shared Lives would be supporting their In-House colleagues to ensure the transition is carried out in a smooth way.

Cares were assured their three monthly supervisions would carry on as normal and that Carer's meetings would take place every 6 months.

#### **Fear to the unknown**

Carers shared the anxiety the proposed change in the management of the scheme has triggered in some of their service users.

Carers were assured current placements will not be affected by the management transfer. Carers were explained the different parts of the consultation process that

involve service users and were asked for their opinion about its structure and how it could be made more person-centred.

Carers were instrumental in making sure service users and relatives/advocates received information regarding the proposed transfer. Following their guidance, some of the service users were met in group rather than individually.

### **Am I going to become 'institutionalised' / Overregulation?**

4 carers were concerned the transfer to the In-House scheme would imply somebody coming to their homes and telling them what to do (imposing a particular way of doing things).

During the individual interviews and the focus group it was discussed that both schemes are registered with the CQC and as such they follow the same standards; therefore, there would not be major changes in how things are being done. It was also discussed the In-House staff would need to ask carers questions in order to have a clear idea about the support delivered and to ensure all paper work is being done correctly. This would be also an opportunity for carers to ask questions to the In-House scheme, share their ideas regarding care deliverance and an overall chance to build rapport between the In-House Shared Lives officers and the carers. Carers agreed about the need to ask questions and share information in order to ensure Shared Lives follows local and national guidance. It was highlighted by two carers that this would also ensure coherence in the delivery of support.

During each individual interview it was briefly examined each carer's ways of delivering support. The variety found was acknowledged by carers as one of the main strengths in the Shared Lives provision.

### ▼ **SPFT staff**

The most valued aspect of the scheme highlighted by SPFT staff was the knowledge and experience of carers regarding mental health. Shared Lives staff considered carers to be flexible, adaptable and resilient. Carers were also described as caring and willing to go that extra mile that makes a difference in the lives of service users.

As potential challenges regarding the transfer, it was highlighted the following:

- Potential anxiety from the carers towards the **banding system** of the In-house scheme
- The fact that SPFT Shared Lives is a small scheme and it is to certain degree isolated. Carers do not have connection to other professional network. The transfer could in that regard involve a **culture shock**.  
It was mentioned that if Committee agrees for the transfer, it would be helpful if besides introductions the In-House scheme could prepare a presentation for carers about their service and how it is run. This would help reducing levels of anxiety and smoothing any culture shock for the carers
- It was also discussed the need to establish new links to mental health support so to have a **clear point of contact for service users**.  
It was agreed that a flowchart with each Service User connection with a mental health coordinator (care manager, social worker, consultant, etc) would be done in order to ensure clear points of contact.

Positives of the transfer:

- Carers possibility of networking and having more support (e.g. training, talks)

- Carers support informally each other and this can set a new template to Shared Lives In-house where this informal support takes place but in not such a scale as in SPFT.

#### Discussion about the handover

- Training regarding mental Health will be offered to the In-House scheme
- Historical information about the SPFT Shared Lives scheme will be given to the In-House scheme. Details of carer's style of deliverance of care will be discussed once Committee has approved the proposed transfer and individual presentations between carers and In-House staff have been done. This is to avoid any bias preconception towards any carer

#### ∇ **In-House Shared Lives staff**

As potential challenges, the following were ascertained

- Supporting a new service group will bring challenges as staff will need to be updated about Mental Health structures, systems, procedures, etc. It was discussed the need for the In-House to have a clear reference regarding each **service user's professional support**. In-House will also need to understand the funding process
- Shared Lives officers are aware the transfer can be successful only if a new member of the staff is recruited and trained before it takes place. **A new staff structure** within the In-House service needs to be ascertained and implemented before the transfer begins; otherwise the transfer would not be feasible as other responsibilities such as support to current In-House carers, referrals, reviews and overall workload cannot be neglected.
- **Administrative coherence**. In-House will need to adapt their forms and procedures to include Mental Health.
- A discussion took place about SPFT carers' potential expectations and concerns regarding the In-House scheme. In-House is happy to carry out a presentation of how their scheme functions. They also discussed the possibility of bringing one or two In-House carers with them when being introduced to the six SPFT carers
- The In-House scheme would like to have an insight about the different documents used by SPFT Shared Lives. Shared Lives officers are aware both schemes are registered with the CQC and therefore follow the same outcomes. Having said this, they would like to have an opportunity to look at templates of care plans, risk assessments, financial recording, and any other relevant document. This will give them an insight so to review their own documents and to ascertain how the SPFT scheme operates and different levels of paperwork

#### Positives of the transfer

- It was highlighted as the main positive the fact that the transfer has triggered an **upfront investment to recruit a new Shared Lives manager**. This investment is now independent from the transfer and agreed for the overall expansion of the scheme.  
A new member of the staff would bring more mobility and capacity to the team, it would strengthen the scheme
- It was discussed the positive impact that the scheme will experience by supporting a new service user's group. The transfer of SPFT Shared Lives will give In-House the opportunity to increase their knowledge, skills and

flexibility, to liaise with professionals from Mental Health and to understand the structure of Mental Health services.

- Another positive effect is that In-House will have an opportunity to evaluate their current working practice and to add knowledge and experience from SPFT Shared Lives staff to current procedures
- In-House staff also noted the potential benefits of supporting the 6 SPFT Shared Lives carers. These carers are already well established and their impact can be very positive for both staff and In-House carers.

#### Discussion about the handover

- Realistic expectations regarding **time scales** need to be negotiated and ascertained by both schemes following Committee decision. The In-House scheme is aware rapport and trust are to be built with the SPFT carers and service users and this will take some time to consolidate. In-House would appreciate if the transfer is done during a period of 3 or 4 months so they can refer back to the SPFT Shared Lives staff with any query.
- During the month of June the In-House scheme will be relocated from Denmark Villas to Bartholomew House. The scheme will also go paper free. This poses a major challenge in itself and will have a direct effect in the handover process
- In-House would like to make sure a final carer review will take place before the transfer so to have updated information regarding carers. This will add valuable information to any presentation, introduction and verbal handover that might take place