

Appendix 3a

Provision of overnight unit-based short breaks for children with disabilities

Consultation survey results

A consultation was run from 8th January to 19th February 2018 on the provision of overnight unit-based short breaks for children with disabilities. A consultation survey was created and made available to complete online or via a paper version that could be emailed or posted.

Below is the information from this survey along with a summary of the comments made.

44 survey responses were received in total. 18 out of 44 left email addresses to be contacted about the consultation feedback.

What is your interest in overnight unit based short breaks? Please let us know whether you are a:-

Child/young person - 2

Parent/carer - 35

Professional - 5

Provider - 1

Councillor - 0

Other - 1 (Retired Social Worker)

Do you or your child currently access an overnight unit based short break in Worcestershire?

Yes - 24

No - 13

Blanks - 7

If yes, which unit do you access?

Ludlow Road – 3

Osborne Court – 9

Providence Road – 3

Moule Close - 7

Other – 2 (Russell House & Church View)

Where do you live?

Bromsgrove - 6

Malvern Hills - 2

Redditch - 5

Worcester City - 3

Wychavon - 1

Wyre Forest - 15

County-wide - 2
Outside of Worcestershire - 2
Blanks - 8

Where do you work?

Bromsgrove - 1
Malvern Hills - 0
Redditch - 0
Worcester City - 1
Wychavon - 0
Wyre Forest - 5
County-wide - 1
Outside of Worcestershire – 0
Blanks - 36

Please state whether you agree/disagree/neither agree nor disagree with proposal 1:

Review of the needs of all families currently accessing overnight unit-based provision to ensure that the needs of carers and children with disabilities are being met in the most appropriate way

Agree - 35
Disagree - 6
Neither agree nor disagree - 3

Of those that agreed with this proposal, the majority commented that reviews should be carried out regularly to ensure the needs of children, young people and families are being met appropriately. Some have these reviews already but commented that this might not be the same for everyone. Some commented that this review would help to identify where the needs are so services can be designed around this but most focused on having the review to improve services for families.

Of those that disagreed with this proposal, the majority commented that needs are already being met and/or are reviewed by social workers regularly anyway so this would be an unnecessary exercise.

Please state whether you agree/disagree/neither agree nor disagree with proposal 2:

Cease the delivery of overnight provision at Ludlow Road, Kidderminster at the end of the summer term 2018 and provide suitable and alternative provision for existing users. This proposal is based on the consideration of availability of other provision in the north of the county, the need to reduce the number of beds available to four, the potential costs of meeting Ofsted registration requirements and the potential to have more flexible and cost effective provision at Providence Road, which is also located in the north of the county.

Agree - 1

Disagree - 29

Neither agree nor disagree - 14

Of those that disagreed with this proposal, the key themes discussed in the comments were:

- Providence Road would be unable to meet the health needs of the children currently accessing Ludlow Road
- This would leave no health provision in the north of the County
- Transitioning children to alternative provision would have a negative impact on the child and their family
- Ludlow Road operates well and provides good support to the children and families who access it
- Travel distances to alternative provision would be too far
- Taking away provision at Ludlow Road would cause family breakdown and crisis resulting in more expensive provision in the future (e.g. social care)
- There are safeguarding risks to mixing children who access Providence Road with those who access Ludlow Road (mix of behaviour and health needs)
- The training, staff and equipment needed at other units would exceed the savings made by stopping provision at Ludlow Road
- There is already not enough provision, it should be increased rather than reduced
- This would impact on the families currently accessing the other units – e.g. take away flexibility of days or amount of days families can access

Of those that neither agreed nor disagreed with this proposal, the majority said it was because they weren't aware of the provision delivered at Ludlow Road or in the north of the County in general. One person said they agree with this proposal in principal if nursing staff would be available at Providence Road, however were concerned that Ludlow Road was always at full capacity so was unsure how reducing provision would help this. Questions were also asked around considering transport costs for families needed to access alternative units in an emergency.

The comment from the person who 'agreed' to this didn't marry up with the comment they left so it should be assumed this was 'agreed' in error and this person actually disagreed with the proposal.

Please state whether you agree/disagree/neither agree nor disagree with proposal 3:

Increase the capacity at Providence Road, Bromsgrove by the flexible use of one or two additional bedrooms (subject to the necessary changes to the Ofsted registration) as required

Agree - 12

Disagree - 13

Neither agree nor disagree - 19

Of those that agreed with this proposal, all said that an increase in provision and to make use of the bedrooms that are currently not used would be welcomed to offer more families respite, or flexibility for those currently accessing respite. There was also a comment around ensuring staffing levels would increase accordingly.

Of those that disagreed with this proposal, this was because of the below reasons:

- Providence Road would not be able to meet the needs of the children who currently access Ludlow Road and would jeopardise the quality of care received by children accessing both of these units
- Adding two extra bedrooms wouldn't meet the demand for overnight respite
- Providence Road is too far to travel for families who live in the north of the County

Of those that neither agreed nor disagreed with this proposal, this was because of the below reasons:

- Adding capacity at Providence Road shouldn't come at the cost of stopping provision at Ludlow Road.
- Agree to increase beds at Providence Road to meet needs however not for children with complex health needs unless the right staffing and equipment was in place
- Concern about the mix of children with high level health needs with those who currently access Providence Road

Please state whether you agree/disagree/neither agree nor disagree with proposal 4:

Review the use of Osborne Court unit in Malvern to ensure that the current capacity (including the use of the two bed emergency and assessment bungalow) is used effectively.

Agree - 19

Disagree - 9

Neither agree nor disagree - 16

Of those that agreed with this proposal, the majority agreed to reviewing this provision to ensure it is meeting needs of all children and young people. Many added to this and said that any review should not be detrimental to the families who already access this provision and be used to identify where provision could be improved or increased. It was also added around ensuring staffing levels are increased accordingly. One comment said that provision for teenagers would be good to allow a smoother transition to adult services for young people. Another said that the alternative bungalow could be used for regular respite.

Of those that disagreed with this proposal, many said that this shouldn't come at the cost of stopping provision at Ludlow Road. Other comments included:

- Osborne Court sounds like it's a mini institution and not the 'home from home' unit like Ludlow Road
- Concern for what would happen if these beds are needed in an emergency, as they are meant for now, as well as the flexibility for the families who currently access this unit
- Distance to Osborne Court is too far for some families

Of those that neither agreed nor disagreed with this proposal, most did not comment. Of those that did comment, it was because they didn't know enough about this provision to comment or that Malvern was too far away to access so it was irrelevant to comment. Other comments said that any review shouldn't affect the families currently accessing this must needed provision. Another comment said that this proposal would make sense because of the waiting list currently in place for Osborne Court however they would be concerned that the mix of children accessing this unit on different nights would reduce the flexibility of when children can attend the unit.

Considering all four proposals as a whole, do you feel that the overnight short break needs of you and your family or the families you work with can be met?

Out of the 38 people that commented, below is a breakdown of the categories of responses:

12 – No, needs would not be met if Ludlow Road was to close

11 – Needs are currently met by other provision (and wouldn't want things to change)

6 – Needs aren't being met now and these proposals don't seem like they would help that

3 – Yes, to ensure units are being used effectively

2 – No

4 – Not sure, would need more information to comment

Additional comments

A lot of comments have been provided around the value of respite for parent carers and the positive effect this has on the whole family and their ability to continue providing care for their children. The majority of comments provided focus on the negative impact these proposals will have on families; particularly those accessing Ludlow Road. Many comments shared a concern that there currently isn't enough respite and/or that these proposals will reduce the amount of respite that is available.

Other comments detailed concerns for how the consultation has been carried out and some requested more information about costings and current/anticipated need as well as involving families more in the review to ensure that needs are properly met.