

# **Orion Programme**

## **Summary Report on the Peer Review for Disabled Adaptations**

16<sup>th</sup> June 2010

## The process

- 1 The peer review for Disabled Adaptations (carried out simultaneously with Gas Servicing) is the second carried out in Sovereign Group. The staff selected to form the team included a Lead from Housing Management, and three staff who currently work in Disabled Adaptations services within the Associations. Training on inspection techniques was delivered to both staff and residents by an external consultant.
- 2 The process of peer reviewing is:
  - Form the team and provide training
  - Provide documents relating to the service (including performance information, policies, procedures, complaints, etc.) to all team members
  - Team meets to discuss focus for the review at each Association
  - Team divides into sub-teams to carry out site visits to each Association
  - Whole team reconvenes to discuss findings and agree recommendations
  - Report produced for managers and the Group Residents Forum.
- 3 All staff contacted during the process of this review proved welcoming, helpful and accommodating, and the review team would like to express their thanks to those staff for allowing them to carry out their activities efficiently and unhindered.

## Best practice - highlights

Works are funded up to the value of £2,500 without means-testing. **Sovereign Vale**

When new kitchens and bathrooms are to be installed as part of planned maintenance, residents are contacted prior to works commencing, asking them to confirm if they require an aid or adaptation so that the work can be synchronised. **Sovereign Vale**

Articles in newsletters feature case studies to demonstrate to residents what is available in terms of aids and adaptations. **Sovereign Vale**

Resident profiling information is used to target awareness campaigns for the service. **Sovereign Twynham**

At the start of the process, staff visit residents to assess their need and provide help with applications. **Sovereign South+West**

Staff carry out site visits whilst works are ongoing to check progress and confirm that residents are satisfied. **Sovereign South+West**

Copies of service information leaflets are provided in doctors' surgeries and to Occupational Therapists. **Sovereign South+West**

A system for quality audits includes a process for taking corrective action on identified issues, and provides an audit trail to ensure works are progressed and completed to a high standard. **Sovereign South+West**

Service Level Agreements with Local Authorities are being updated to address performance issues over waiting times for responses from Occupational Therapists. **Sovereign Kingfisher**

Private or locum OTs are occasionally used to help clear backlogs and speed up the service delivered to residents. **Sovereign Kingfisher**

A database is available to the Association, stakeholders and partners, showing details of all adapted properties in the Hampshire region. **Sovereign Kingfisher**

**Staff from the Citizens' Advice Bureau are embedded in the Association, enabling staff to refer residents with a need directly to them.** Sovereign Kingfisher

# The results

## Sovereign Vale (East Hanney)

- 4 The service provided by Sovereign Vale is of a mixed quality. Staff involved in delivering the service are knowledgeable and experienced, although lack ownership for the whole process. There are no Service Level Agreements (SLAs) with Local Authorities. Meetings are held with Occupational Therapists (OTs) and other stakeholders, but are without terms of reference, and lack action. No policy exists for the service, and both the procedure and information leaflet are out of date. The procedure also lacks key detail, which hampers performance monitoring. There can be delays in receiving referrals from OTs and this is reflected in feedback from residents, many of whom were frustrated by the timescales involved and the lack of regular updates from a single point of contact.
- 5 An annual satisfaction survey for the service is carried out, yet this is not timely enough. Fifty percent of responses from the last survey showed some degree of negative feedback, but there was no evidence to demonstrate how this had driven service improvements. Complaints and compliments are not actively monitored locally, although levels of both are very low. Responses to ongoing surveys are positive, and works are completed to a high standard.
- 6 A Disability In Focus group gives residents the opportunity to discuss relevant issues. Information is provided on the service in the residents' handbook, and the website features a clear explanation of the process, including contact details. Otherwise, the service is promoted via the Association's newsletter with a series of very good articles and case studies that describe the different types of aid/adaptation on offer, what can be funded and when an OT referral is needed. A dedicated email address for the service is available internally for staff, although this could be better utilised by also being published to residents.
- 7 Works up to £2,500 are funded without means-testing. For Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) works, advocacy is available from Anchor Staying Put to residents, including help with completing forms. Signposting is given to those who do not qualify for a grant, although this is not a standard practice.
- 8 SV will refurbish an entire bathroom when an adaptation is carried out, and when planned refurbishments for kitchens and bathrooms are due, residents are asked if they have a need for an aid or adaptation prior to the commencement of works. Opportunities for recycling are limited, although stair-lifts are retained in properties where needed. It is uncertain whether adapted properties are appropriately flagged via the housing management system since records are kept locally on a spreadsheet and not always transferred in a routine, timely manner. Staff claim that 100% of works are audited, but there was no evidence to support this.
- 9 There is no Equality Impact Assessment in place, and no evidence that the Association plans to target its service in line with the resident profiling data being collected. The use of Anchor Staying Put as advocates is positive, although it does attract a charge of £100 for each application (incorporated into the grant). On supplying adapted kitchens, SV use the Group's preferred supplier who offers a competitive rate.

## 10 Key strengths

- Articles in newsletter are informative and of a very high standard.

- A Disability In Focus group has links to the service.
- High standard of works carried out on adaptations in properties.
- Using the Group-negotiated contract for greater savings on kitchens.
- Dedicated internal email address for the service.
- Works up to £2,500 are funded without the need for means-testing.
- Fast-tracking for residents discharged from hospital.
- Signposting available for residents in need of financial assistance.
- Residents are contacted and asked if they require an aid or adaptation prior to planned maintenance of refurbishment of kitchens and bathrooms.
- When installing an adaptation into a bathroom, the entire room is refurbished.
- In void properties in sheltered or similar schemes, lever taps are fitted as standard.

## **11 Key weaknesses**

- Greater ownership of the entire service needed.
- Signposting for residents is not offered as a routine service.
- Use of Anchor Staying Put may not provide good value for money.
- No policy for the service; procedure lacks detail. Difficult to monitor performance without clear timescales.
- Insufficient training for frontline staff on what the service can offer residents.
- Customer satisfaction survey is not timely, and no evidence of how feedback is used to shape the service.
- Records not always updated on the housing management system in a timely way.
- Not actively using resident profiling data to influence the service.
- Existing contract with SEC not reviewed for value for money.
- Meetings with Occupational Therapists have no stated aims and objectives and no measurable outcomes.
- No Equality Impact Assessment for the service.
- No Service Level Agreements with Local Authorities.
- No active monitoring of complaints and compliments for the service.
- Quality audits on works cannot be evidenced.

## **Sovereign Twynham (Christchurch)**

12 The service provided by Sovereign Twynham is of an uncertain quality. It appears that insufficient staff resources are allocated to the service, with no set cover arranged for leave or other absence. In the past, the loss of key staff has caused delays for residents, and it is unclear that the potential of this reoccurring is being addressed. Positively, staff have good links with their contractor, and are now beginning to work more closely with Occupational Therapists (OTs), including developing a new Service Level Agreement (SLA) and attending regular liaison meetings, albeit without follow up. Frontline staff have a limited knowledge of aids and adaptations and the Association's role: if the service manager is unavailable, they will ask callers to try again later. The service

- 13 The service lacks robust performance management or ownership of results. There are no targets for performance in either the policy or the procedure, and inconsistencies exist between the policy, procedure and the information leaflet, particularly in terms of timescales. Assessment categories are not given in the procedure, which also lacks a clear flowchart with responsibilities and timescales, and in general could be improved to be more explicit, particularly in light of the low staff resources applied to the service. The budget for aids and adaptations has not changed in two years, and a recent application to increase it was not approved.
- 14 A satisfaction survey is carried out, although not in line with the written procedure. Feedback from residents is positive, and staff say they will liaise with the contractor to resolve negative feedback or complaints, yet this is not routinely documented. The service is promoted through regular articles in newsletters and a well-written information leaflet is available. Relevant content on the website is brief and only mirrors the leaflet, without contact details for queries or applications.
- 15 All applications for both minor and major aids and adaptations are means-tested, and it appears that no-one has failed as yet. Every application goes to an OT first for approval/referral, including for minor aids, adding to the therapist's workload and slowing down the process for residents, however staff believe this process was a requirement from the 2008 Audit Commission inspection report. The Association also believes that the majority of works are carried out within four weeks of receiving a written referral from an OT, but this is based on anecdotal evidence alone.
- 16 An organisation, Anchor Staying Put, will act as advocates for residents and help them complete applications forms for grant funding, although the value for money of this service is questionable. Works are not necessarily done in conjunction with complete bathroom refurbishments, and no post-works audits are carried out: a new programme of auditing from January 2010 could not be adequately evidenced. The Association does not appear to be checking that timescales for aids and adaptations are being met.
- 17 There is no recycling of aids. Information on adapted properties is held on a spreadsheet outside of the housing management system, and it is uncertain that the latter is updated with this information regularly. Otherwise, case studies showed that information management on individual hard-copy files was carried out appropriately. The Association has made good use of its profiling data and has recently undertaken a targeted campaign for aids and adaptations. This led to increased levels of interest in the service and more works being carried out. An Equality Impact Assessment is in place, however this needs review as it has not been completed comprehensively. Staff were unable to say whether the contract with Tess Construction offered good value for money since they were uncertain of the contract history and whether any benchmarking work had been done to evaluate it.

## **18 Key strengths**

- Targeted campaign for the service aimed at residents identified through the profiling exercise.
- Increased promotion of the service through resident newsletters.
- Good information leaflet available for residents.
- Working on producing a Service Level Agreement with Local Authority.

- Improved working relationships with Occupational Therapists.
- Hard-copy documentation is well managed.

## 19 Key weaknesses

- Information on the website requires updating.
- Use of Anchor Staying Put does not provide good value for money.
- Insufficient training for frontline staff on what the service can offer residents.
- Email enquiries are not consistently answered in line with Customers First timescales.
- Resident satisfaction surveys not carried out in line with procedure.
- Staff resources for the service appear inadequate.
- Budget for the service not increased in line with advertising campaigns and greater numbers of applications.
- No active management of resident feedback and complaints.
- No robust performance management for the service.
- Inconsistencies between policy, procedure and information leaflet.
- Procedure lacks clarity, flowcharts and clear responsibilities and timescales.
- All applications for aids and adaptations referred to Occupational Therapists.
- Means-testing carried out on all applications.
- Adaptation works not aligned with planned bathroom refurbishments.
- Information on adapted properties held outside the housing management system, and adapted properties not routinely flagged to Housing staff.
- No evidence of quality audits carried out on works.

## Sovereign South+West (Newbury)

20 The service provided by Sovereign South+West is of a very good quality. Staff demonstrate very good knowledge, are proactive, and aim to provide a high level of customer care. Road shows have been held for staff to raise their awareness of aids and adaptations, and are planned to be repeated. There are monthly meetings with Social Services teams to discuss active cases and any issues, and a Service Level Agreement (SLA) is in place with the main Local Authority, with other SLAs being developed elsewhere. There are good working relationships with contractors, who are vetted to try and ensure that they will provide a high standard of service to disabled, elderly or otherwise vulnerable residents.

21 The policy states that performance monitoring begins at referral, which – based on interpretation – is not how the service works in practice. Flowcharts in the procedure are not entirely clear, do not always have a timescale attached, and staff agree that these could be improved. Telephone enquiries receive good responses, although email enquiries do not always receive a prompt reply. The manager for the service carries out on-site visits to check that works are proceeding as planned and to timescale, and that residents are satisfied. Site surveys are carried out on twenty percent of minor-works jobs and all Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) works. Satisfaction is high, with low numbers of complaints and a system in place to address any issues.

- 22 The service is advertised via articles in the newsletter and the website, however staff admit that they also rely on 'word of mouth' from residents to promote it more widely. Information is available on the service in the residents' handbook and on the website, but the latter lacks detail. An information leaflet is provided for residents, although its current content is basic and needs to be in Plain English. Both the website and the leaflet have recently been re-designed and are being reviewed by the residents' Disability In Focus panel, to be re-launched shortly with improved content. The leaflet is also available in doctors' surgeries and copies are sent to Occupational Therapists (OTs) in the West Berkshire region, though not replicated further afield.
- 23 After receiving an enquiry, staff will visit to verify the resident's need and provide help with application forms if they live in the West Berkshire region only. Minor works up to £500 are not means-tested and do not require a referral from an OT. In the last fifteen months, three residents have failed means-testing for works under £2,500. Those residents who do not qualify for grant funding will be referred back to their OT and may be signposted by the Association to charitable organisations who could assist financially. It is unclear, though, that this signposting happens as a routine, as it is not expressed in the procedure.
- 24 Information on adapted properties is routinely logged on the housing management system when works are completed. There is limited recycling of aids. Where adaptations are needed to a bathroom or kitchen, these are not specifically carried out in line with whole room refurbishments. If remedial works are needed following a quality audit, a Corrective Action Report is raised, with works followed up. As yet a CAR has not been required for any aids or adaptations jobs.
- 25 The Association has not carried out any targeted campaigns based on resident profiling data, but plans to begin this once more of the data has been collected. An Equality Impact Assessment is not yet in place. Schedules of rates have been agreed with all contractors for West Berkshire, and audited in 2009. Work is ongoing with contractors to improve value for money on individual components, such as showers.

## **26 Key strengths**

- Service promoted to residents via articles in newsletters.
- All residents who request a service in West Berks region are visited and help provided with completing application forms.
- Signposting given to residents who do not qualify for grant funding.
- System in place for auditing works and obtaining timely customer feedback.
- Disability In Focus panel has helped re-design website content and planned leaflet.
- Leaflets available in doctors' surgeries and sent to Occupational Therapists in West Berks region.
- Staff carry out visits to check works in progress and resident satisfaction.
- Road shows held to improve frontline and general staff awareness of the service.
- Contractors vetted to ensure they are suitable to work with vulnerable residents.
- Information on adapted properties routinely logged on the housing management system.
- Have an improved system for quality audits.

## 27 Key weaknesses

- Information on current website is difficult to locate and lacks detail.
- Email enquiries not always answered within Customers First standards.
- Initial in-person visits not made to residents outside the West Berks region who request a service, or to provide assistance with completing application forms.
- No targeting of the service to residents using profiling data.
- Information leaflet is basic and requires review.
- Leaflets not available in doctors' surgeries or for Occupational Therapists beyond the West Berks region.
- Performance monitoring against timescales requires review or clarification.
- Flowcharts in the procedure are not entirely clear.
- Some hard-copy records not routinely kept to evidence residents are informed of progress throughout their application.
- When works for minor aids and adaptations are approved, residents are not informed in writing.
- No Equality Impact Assessment in place for the service.

## Sovereign Kingfisher (Basingstoke)

28 The service provided by Sovereign Kingfisher is of a good quality. Service Level Agreements (SLAs) are in place with Local Authorities, and are currently being updated to cover issues around waiting times with Occupational Therapists (OTs). There are regular meetings with OTs, and minutes from these show that performance is routinely discussed. The budget for the service has significantly increased for 2010/11, although it will still be run by one member of staff, which could lead to some delays if the workload proves unmanageable. There is no performance monitoring in place for stages within the current procedure, however targets have been set for inclusion in the new policy. For minor aids and adaptations the current target of completion within ten working days is not adhered to.

29 Customer satisfaction surveys are issued, but these are not tailored to aids and adaptations, and appear to focus on generic customer service. There is no evidence that the information gathered is appropriately analysed or that it influences service delivery, although results from a service-specific survey carried out late in 2009 did help to set priorities for change. Additionally, the single complaint from 08/09 resulted in an improvement. Complaints are not routinely logged on the housing management system, however from April 2010 this will be improved. Resident feedback is good, with particular praise for the speed of service received, and responses to queries are timely and contain comprehensive information. Knowledge by frontline staff not directly involved with the service can be poor, but this is being addressed by a new programme of training.

30 To date, there has been no tailored advertising carried out for the service. An article will be included in the next newsletter, and there are plans to carry out future road-shows to sheltered schemes and areas with high levels of disabled residents. Information on aids and adaptations is included in the residents' handbook, yet the website contains very little detail. No specific information leaflet exists for the service, however it is planned to issue a factsheet for residents soon and a Group-wide leaflet will shortly be launched.

- 31 Customer Service Advisors will shortly be trained to approve minor aids under £500. Currently, there is no means-testing or OT referral for works under £500, and from April 2010 there will be no means-testing under £2,500. Where necessary, the Association may make use of a private OT to help speed up the process. Residents are offered help with filling out application forms, but this is not a routine service offered up front. For those who do not qualify for grant funding, the Association will either signpost or help with the funding on a case-by-case basis. SK will restrict their involvement with DFG works to assisting residents with the application process only.
- 32 A database is available to Local Authorities and other Associations that lists all adapted properties in Hampshire, and Housing staff and OTs work closely together to ensure that adapted properties are allocated appropriately. The recycling of aids is not formalised at the Association since SK prefers to make appropriate allocations of properties and has had few requirements for recycled aids or adaptations in the past – however this will be covered in the new policy. Adaptations are not necessarily done in line with whole bathroom or kitchen refurbishments.
- 33 Quality audits are not routine; from April 2010 these will be carried out on all works over £350, and ten percent of those under £350. As no technical staff work for the service in SK, detailed specifications of works are not issued to contractors unless OTs provide these to the Association. This practice may cause issues later if the contractor is relied upon to determine such details. Invoices from some works show that VAT is regularly being paid unnecessarily, although the change to KBS for all works will remove this problem. An Equality Impact Assessment is in place, but requires further work to include an action plan. The contract and rates with KBS have been benchmarked to ensure good value for money; the Association has also secured improved rates on wet rooms with KBS, which now cost one third less than previously.

### **34 Key strengths**

- Support offered to residents with application forms.
- Signposting given to other agencies for residents with financial or other needs; Citizens' Advice Bureau staff embedded in the Association.
- Resident feedback gathered at the time of job completion.
- Contract with Kingfisher Building Services benchmarked for competitiveness.
- Equality Impact Assessment in place for the service.
- Providing increased value for money on wet-room installation.
- Service Level Agreements are in place with Local Authorities.
- Large increase in budget for 2010/11.
- The single complaint from 08/09 led to a service improvement.
- System in place to cover staff absence.
- No means-testing or OT referral needed for works under £500 (from April means-testing limit raised to £2,500).
- Use private/locum OT when there is a backlog to help speed up service to residents.
- Have access to a Hampshire-wide database listing all adapted properties in the region.
- Housing staff and OTs work together to ensure adapted properties are appropriately allocated.

- Lever taps fitted as standard in all properties including voids.

### **35 Key weaknesses**

- Website provides insufficient information on the service for residents.
- Knowledge by frontline staff of what the service offers can be poor.
- No timescales or targets on Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) works, and do not 'own' this process.
- Adaptations works not aligned with bathroom or kitchen replacement programmes.
- Detailed specification of works not issued to contractors from the team, relying on OTs.
- No specific information leaflet available for the service.
- Specific targeting of the service not carried out in line with resident profiling data.
- Quality audits on completed works not currently carried out (planned to change from April).
- No specific information given to frontline staff on the service (planned to change from April).
- No internal performance monitoring for stages of the process.

## The Review Team

The team for this review comprised staff and residents, supported by the Orion Project Manager and Assistant.

Lead Inspector: Amanda Green, Housing Operations Manager, Sovereign South+West

Subject specialists: Tony Belcher, Estates Manager, Sovereign Vale  
Esther Findlay, Maintenance Manager, Sovereign South+West  
Trevor Percy, Surveyor (Building Services), Sovereign Kingfisher  
Ellie Roberts, Area Housing Manager, Sovereign Kingfisher

Resident Inspectors: Jonathan Hewitt – Sovereign Vale resident  
Chris Holliday – Sovereign Vale resident  
Teresa Nightingale – Sovereign South+West resident  
Jo Gardiner – Sovereign South+West resident  
Bryn German – Sovereign South+West resident  
Rebecca Evans – Sovereign Kingfisher resident  
Peter Lucas – Sovereign Twynham resident

The peer review took place between January and March 2010. Dates for site visits were:

Sovereign Vale (East Hanney) – 8-9<sup>th</sup> February  
Sovereign Twynham (Christchurch) – 15-16<sup>th</sup> February  
Sovereign South+West (Newbury) – 18-19<sup>th</sup> February  
Sovereign Kingfisher (Basingstoke) – 23-24<sup>th</sup> February

The commentary in this report contains the findings of the peer review team, using the evidence gathered from interviews with managers, staff and residents (service users); mystery shopping; visits to properties; case studies and documentation reviews and checks.

## What are we doing to improve?

Actions – Sovereign Vale	Timescale
Report to Group-wide Disability in Focus panel how resident feedback has influenced the service delivery for aids and adaptations.	Tbc
Adopt the ‘Trusted Assessors’ scheme or similar, to enable staff to determine and approve minor aids and adaptations. Use locum Occupational Therapists to deal with short-term application backlogs.	Tbc
Align levels of means-testing across the Group.	Tbc
Provide training and information to frontline staff on what the service offers to residents and how to apply.	September 2010
Produce a policy and updated procedures for the service, including clear timescales, performance monitoring and responsibilities, and align both documents.	July 2010
Improve ownership of the process by staff from the first point of contact from residents, and ensure residents are given a named contact in all communications.	May 2010
Ensure that all residents are signposted to other means of funding if they do not qualify for a grant.	July 2010
Update the information leaflet to clarify to residents who to contact to apply for an aid or adaptation, and what to do if they cannot afford a financial contribution.	July 2010
Put in place a timely customer feedback survey, ensuring that the results are appropriately analysed, fed back to staff and used to drive service improvements.	Completed
Keep Housing teams informed of properties with adaptations by efficiently updating the housing management system with the relevant information.	August 2010

Make better use of profiling information to help shape and target the service to residents.	September 2010
Establish a more frequent series of meetings with Occupational Therapists, which have clear aims and outcomes and are formally minuted.	July 2010
Complete an Equality Impact Assessment for the service.	August 2010
Agree a Service Level Agreement with Local Authorities for the service.	March 2011
Establish a monitoring system for complaints and compliments, to include management of actions taken, and feed back information to staff.	August 2010
Ensure that post-works inspections are carried out routinely and that a robust monitoring system is in place.	August 2010
Clarify timescales in the procedure to assist with performance management. Monitor timescales from the first contact by the resident.	July 2010
Where possible, recycle aids.	September 2010
When creating support plans for residents, routinely ask if they require an aid or adaptation.	September 2010
Publicise to residents the email contact details for the service.	July 2010

<b>Actions – Sovereign Twynham</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Report to Group-wide Disability in Focus panel how resident feedback has influenced the service delivery for aids and adaptations.	
Adopt the 'Trusted Assessors' scheme or similar, to enable staff to determine and approve minor aids and adaptations.	

Use locum Occupational Therapists to deal with short-term application backlogs.	
Align levels of means-testing across the Group.	Completed
Update and improve the website to include information on the service, how to apply and contact details.	
Provide training and information to frontline staff on what the service offers to residents and how to apply.	30 May
Ensure adequate staff resources are applied to the service, and provide cover during periods of staff absence.	Completed
Review current Equality Impact Assessment and complete thoroughly.	15 June
Update the service leaflet, including clear contact information for applications, and match to both policy and procedures.	30 June
Update the policy and procedure to include process flowcharts, full timescales, assessment categories, and details of how performance will be measured.	30 June
Establish a system for analysing, monitoring and following up on resident feedback.	Completed
Carry out exercise to determine whether contract with Tess Construction Ltd offers good value for money.	30 June
Ensure that meetings with Occupational Therapists are regular, minuted with copies received, and that they have clear aims and outcomes.	Completed
Ensure that emails from residents are answered in line with Customers First standards.	Ongoing
When creating support plans for residents, routinely ask if they require an aid or adaptation.	Completed
Re-assess current budget provision for the service. Review against resident profiling information and benchmark.	Completed
Establish a process for documenting actions undertaken with contractor to address individual resident complaints.	Completed
Provide staff with training on performance management for the service, and agree ownership of and accountability for	13 May

the results.	
Take ownership of applications at first point of contact from the resident.	Completed
Approve minor aids and adaptations internally. Remove requirement for blanket means-testing for all works.	Completed
Ensure that information on adapted properties is uploaded to the housing management system promptly.	13 July
Where applicable, and giving consideration to value for money, carry out bathroom refurbishments and adaptation works simultaneously.	Completed
Implement a system of recycling for aids.	30 June
Actively manage process for carrying out post-works audits and monitor results.	Completed
Give staff training on helping residents complete forms for grant funding, rather than using the Anchor Staying Put service.	31 July
Regularly audit process to ensure that stated timescales are being met.	Completed

<b>Actions – Sovereign South+West</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Report to Group-wide Disability in Focus panel how resident feedback has influenced the service delivery for aids and adaptations.	Ongoing
Adopt the 'Trusted Assessors' scheme or similar, to enable staff to determine and approve minor aids and adaptations. Use locum Occupational Therapists to deal with short-term application backlogs.	August 2010
Align levels of means-testing across the Group.	Completed
Ensure that the planned updates to website are carried out in a timely manner, once agreed by the Disability In Focus	April/May 2010

group, and include full information for residents.	
Update procedure flowcharts for clarity and content, and ensure that all stages in the process have timescales attached.	May 2010
Respond to all emails from residents in line with Customers First standards.	Completed
Deliver more targeted promotion of the service to residents, in line with profiling information.	April 2011
Extend help with applications offered to residents to areas beyond West Berkshire.	May/June 2010
Establish a formal routine of signposting for all residents who do not qualify for grant funding.	May 2010
Update and improve the resident leaflet for the service, to include timescales, minor/major definitions and statutory information.	Ongoing
Provide leaflets to GP surgeries and Occupational Therapists beyond the West Berkshire area.	May 2010
Change monitoring system to begin from the first point of contact by the resident/therapist.	Completed
Allow the service administrator to authorise minor aids within an agreed sum without reference to manager.	Ongoing
Establish a routine for confirming works with residents via letter.	Ongoing
Where applicable, and giving consideration to value for money, carry out bathroom refurbishments and adaptation works simultaneously.	Ongoing
Produce an Equality Impact Assessment for the service.	May 2010

<b>Actions – Sovereign Kingfisher</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
---------------------------------------	------------------

Report to Group-wide Disability in Focus panel how resident feedback has influenced the service delivery for aids and adaptations.	
Align levels of means-testing across the Group.	Completed
Adopt the 'Trusted Assessors' scheme or similar, to enable staff to determine and approve minor aids and adaptations. Use locum Occupational Therapists to deal with short-term application backlogs.	Completed
Update and improve the website to include information on the service, how to apply and contact details.	Q1 10/11
Provide training and information to frontline staff on what the service offers to residents and how to apply.	Completed
Establish a monitoring system to evidence that resident feedback is routinely analysed and used to influence service improvements.	Start Q1 10/11, ongoing
Increase targeted advertising of the service to residents.	Start Q1 10/11, ongoing
Carry out analysis to understand whether the service has sufficient staff resources, given budgetary increase.	Q4 10/11
Ensure that the updated policy and letters to residents clearly outlines how grant-funded adaptations will be maintained in future.	Completed
Ensure that targets for minor works are adhered to where possible.	Start Q1 10/11, ongoing
Where applicable, and giving consideration to value for money, carry out bathroom refurbishments and adaptation works simultaneously.	Start Q3 10/11, complete review Q4 10/11

Consider further training for staff to give them technical insight required when specifying works for contractors.	Q4 10/11
Revise the current Equality Impact Assessment for the service to include an action plan.	
Establish timescales for stages of the procedure and ensure that these are clearly detailed in the procedure flowchart.	April 2010
Ensure that from April, planned changes in line with the new policy/procedure are implemented for: performance monitoring; listing adaptations on the housing management system; carrying out service-specific customer surveys; and ensuring works are audited.	Start April 2010, ongoing