

Policy and Scrutiny Scoping Document


Committee	Community & Older People Policy and Scrutiny Committee	
Topic	Individual Budgets	Ref: CWOP-SCR-??
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To act upon the concerns raised by internal audit (reported to the Audit Committee (September 2011)) To ensure the concerns raised are acted upon; and determine what processes are being put into place to act upon the limited assurance raised following the audit 	
Reasons for undertaking review	Concern over the limited assurance on Individual Budgets reported to the Audit Committee (September 2011) on guidance and training; adequacy of financial monitoring; and Quality Assurance and management	
Method <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial briefing to define scope Task & Finish Group Commission Full Committee 	Full Committee	
Membership <i>Only complete if Task and Finish Group or Commission</i>	N/A	

Issues to be addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of compliance with guidance • The lack of clarity amongst practitioners on how individual budgets are expended • The urgent need for training • The introduction of a single monitoring system to include individual budgets and direct payments • The engagement of a dedicated and trained team to establish a monitoring regime for those who have been allocated an individual budget • Risk assessment 		
Sources of Evidence and witnesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers of the Authority • Service users 		
Work Programme	Scrutiny Review to start from November 2011 with consideration of scoping document.		
Indicators of Success	To be completed.		
Meeting the CfPS Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Critical Friend Challenge to Executive</i> • <i>Reflect Public voice and concerns</i> • <i>Own the scrutiny process</i> • <i>Impact on service delivery</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reflect public voice and concerns regarding limited assurance following the audit of Individual Budgets • To own the scrutiny process by undertaking a review of Individual Budgets to make recommendations on outcomes and implementation 		
Diversity and Equality <i>Diversity and Equality issues are to be considered and addressed.</i>	To be completed.		
Date agreed by Committee			
Future Action	To undertake first witness session on 9 November 2011		
Governance	Robert Fox	Committee	Graham Hughes

Officer		Officer	
Service Lead Officer(s)	To be completed – Karen Wright/Liz Chidgey		

Final Internal Audit Report 2010/11 –Financial Monitoring of Personal Budgets (AHCW8)

1. Executive Summary

Department: Adult Health & Community Wellbeing Audit Sponsor: Liz Chidgey – Deputy Executive Director, Adults, Health & Community Wellbeing Distribution List: Liz Chidgey – Deputy Executive Director, Adults, Health & Community Wellbeing Karen Wright – Internal Standards & Governance Director AHCW; Margaret Lee – Executive Director of Finance, Louise Wishart - Audit Commission		Overall Opinion LIMITED ASSURANCE 		Direction of Travel This review is not consistent with a previous audit undertaken.		Date of last review: n/a			
Scope of the Review: The review focused on the financial monitoring aspect of service users with personal budgets to ensure that this is consistently and adequately applied throughout Essex.		Limitations:		Number of Control Design issues identified 0 Critical 0 Major 0 Moderate 0 Best Practice		Number of Control Operating in Practice issues identified 0 Critical 7 Major 0 Moderate 0 Best Practice		Number of Recommendations 7 Made 0 Rejected n/a Critical Rejected 0 Major Rejected	
Critical and Major Findings and Recommendations The AHCW Directorate has a commissioning budget in the region of £500million. Personal budgets were introduced in October 2008 and to date the value of personal budgets is approximately £9million, with in the region of 560 service users opting for a personal budget. Although guidance notes have been compiled by the service in relation to the financial monitoring aspect, the audit review has confirmed that there is a lack of compliance with this guidance. There remains uncertainty amongst practitioners as to how personal budgets may be expended. Cultural issues are also evident as many care packages are costed based on the traditional hourly rates rather than being outcome focused. Training is urgently required to ensure that all practitioners are comfortable with the principles of an outcome based Support Plan as this is an essential element against which expenditure can be assessed and monitored against. It is acknowledged that the service is looking to introduce a single monitoring system that will include both personal budgets and direct payments. However, until a new system is introduced, it is essential that a dedicated and trained team are engaged to establish a monitoring regime of those service users who have been allocated a self-managed (or via appointee) personal budget. This should be based on a risk assessment, considering the vulnerability of the service user and the financial value of the care package.		<div><div><div>Guidance & Training 0 3</div><div>Adequacy of Financial Monitoring 0 1</div><div>Quality Assurance & Management 0 3</div></div><div><div>Each risk area for this review is shown as a segment of the wheel. The key to the colours on the wheel is as follows:</div><div><div>Critical priority Control Design or Control Operating in Practice issues identified</div><div>Major priority Control Design or Control Operating in Practice issues identified</div><div>Moderate priority Control Design or Control Operating in Practice issues identified</div><div>No / Minor Control Design or Control Operating in Practice issues identified</div></div></div></div>							