**Marketplace Event = Children’s Residential Homes – 16th March 2018**

**Table Discussions**

**TD1**

* Need to be clear, honest dialogue on matching expectations around services:

 Education

 Therapy

 Relationships with Social Workers

* Monthly monitoring – suggest a quarterly visit
* Clear dialogue between Authority and Providers
* Clarity on ‘Fee Structure’
* PBR Spec – Not appropriate for Residential Homes
* Write into tender exactly what they want – needs of Cohert – Disablilty (wheelchair) – Matching
* No time limits – not person centred.
* Tier? 1 or above?
* Tupe
* Time frame is too short – Investment? LA plus independent?
* Recruitment and training of staff
* Length of contract (5 years to break even)#
* Clear indication of homes and number of beds
* Hours
* Staffing ratio
* Clear indication of needs
* Long term plans – outcomes
* Costings
* Who would be in charge of decisions (if placement can go ahead)
* Who carries financial risk for a void bed
* Length of stay

**TD2**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2 Bedded Home** |  | **3-4 Bedded Home** |  |
| **Pros** | **Cons** | **Pros** | **Cons** |
| Small ‘family unit’ | More expensive | Higher Staffing | Makes matching more difficult |
| High staff ratios | Small staff teams, sickness/leavers will have a higher impact | More cost effective | Larger models difficult to impact assess when there are more complex children to match |
| Family Atmosphere | Two beds no financially viable – ie staffing costs | More interaction with other service users | Larger group of complex children dilutes ability to meet needs in the same way |
| Stability with staff | Duel home registration is not ‘a given’ by OFSTED so therefore providers may struggle to get this, in which case will not be financially viable  | Staffing is better, changes of staff mean they do not ‘burn out’ so easily | Children do not like more children in placement |
| Easy support |  |  |  |
| Capacity for emergency accommodation  |  |  |  |
| Easier to match |  |  |  |
| Homely |  |  |  |
| Person centred |  |  |  |
| Easier for children to ‘fit in’ socially |  |  |  |
| Smaller place replicates family home/foster care |  |  |  |

**Questions:**

* **Matching considerations – clear guidance within specification?**

KB – Raised and identified within Cheshire East and will be clear within the specification. DL – we have an excellent approach to matching and building the offer for our children leaving care (Ignition) and would want to replicate this for residential care. We would expect a strong partnership to be developed through taking a role at our Resource Allocation Panel.

* **Any analysis of current 44 in Residential?**

KB – Analysed, placements reflect EHCP for disability cases. Younger children are in residential care because there are no other options

* **Why a specialist provider? Why not in-house?**

KB – To cover a varied need across our children, the market is focused on this area of business and brings good practice / support networks. The local authority and it’s managers deal with a complex range of services and we feel it would be difficult to ensure the specific focus required to run outstanding homes

* **Contract term is important as homes need time to deliver Good/Outstanding service**

DL – Contract term will be considered – five to seven years

**More than one provider may be more suitable for the different homes as one provider may be stronger in areas than others.**

DL – This is being considered

**Have Cheshire East considered Framework?**

DL – Cheshire East already use two Frameworks and will continue to do so on top of the new tender

**Timescales? More attractive for providers to bid for manageable and realistic lots**

DL – Lots are being considered

**Difficulty around Ofsted registration – national problem around staffing and employing a registered manager.**

DL/KB – There will be a phased approach on all homes. Challenges will be recognised and Cheshire East will commit to overcome them.