

## Template for Ad Hoc Scrutiny Panel into local services for Autistic Spectrum Condition

<p>1. Matter for scrutiny and reason why raised</p>	<p>To examine local services for people with Autistic Spectrum Condition (ASC) against national guidelines and policy.</p> <p>(Raised to clarify where leadership responsibilities rest, and better define commissioning and funding arrangements)</p>
<p>2. Importance of the matter and relation to Council's strategic priorities and policies</p>	<p>According to DoH (Better Future consultation) there are estimated to be 2,500 ASC people in the city, a proportion of whom will have occasional or ongoing unmet needs for health/social services. The combined Adult Social Care &amp; Housing Directorate budget is the BHCC's largest, amounting to £76.4m for 2010/11. Addressing unmet need may affect the call on public finances.</p> <p>Of the Council's corporate priorities four are met;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better use of public money</li> <li>• reduce inequality by increasing opportunities</li> <li>• fair enforcement of the law</li> <li>• open and effective city leadership</li> </ul>
<p>3. If scrutiny is requested on the basis of a deficiency in the decision making process, evidence that decision not properly made</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>4. Potential benefits of a scrutiny activity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better access and signposting to services</li> <li>• Fairer access and greater equality for all to services</li> <li>• Increased clarity of provision arrangements</li> <li>• Enhanced staff training</li> <li>• Spending efficiency through review</li> </ul>
<p>5. Other avenues tried and extent to which attempts have been made to resolve the matter</p>	<p>The matter was recently raised at the Joint Commissioning Board where greater clarity was sought over which agency had responsibility for local services for people with Autistic Spectrum Condition.</p> <p>Subsequent conversations with the Director of Social Care suggest that the current arrangements would benefit from greater clarity.</p>
<p>6. Any other considerations or relevant information: (e.g. an indication of the desired outcome, relevant evidence, suggested witnesses etc)</p>	<p>Desired outcomes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarify where leadership responsibilities rest,</li> <li>• better define commissioning and funding arrangements</li> <li>• Maximise commissioning effectiveness</li> <li>• Prepare and advise re the ASC Local Plan</li> </ul> <p>Suggested witnesses/evidence providers;</p> <p>Aspire  Assert  BHCC Housing Homeless Vulnerable People team  BHCC – Integrated Learning Disability  Mrs Sarah Brown  Prof Hugo Critchley – Neural Behavioural Clinic  Mrs Maggie Darling  National Autistic Society  PCT (Geraldine Hoban)  SPFT (Richard Ford)  SPFT – Access Team  Service users</p>

7. Suggested type of scrutiny/terms of reference for in-depth review	Ad hoc panel See attached suggested scoping diagram
--	--

17 December 2009

