



Department of

**Health, Social Services
and Public Safety**

www.dhsspsni.gov.uk

AN ROINN

**Sláinte, Seirbhísí Sóisialta
agus Sábháilteachta Poiblí**

MÁNNYSTRIE O

**Poustie, Resydènter Heisin
an Fowk Siccar**

**REVIEW OF DHSSPS TRAINING SUPPORT FUNDING
PROGRAMME FOR SOCIAL CARE
VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS**

FINAL REPORT

FEBRUARY 2011

CONTENTS

	PAGE	
SECTION 1	Introduction	1.
SECTION 2	Rationale and objectives for a review of the training support programme	3.
SECTION 3	Analysis of funding arrangements for the period 2005-2010	5.
SECTION 4	Analysis of consultation with voluntary sector organisations	7.
SECTION 5	Summary of the findings	10.
SECTION 6	Option Appraisal	12.
SECTION 7	Recommendations	16.
Appendix 1	Reference Group	
Appendix 2	Cost of Administration	
Appendix 3	Total Funding Allocation 2005/06-2009/10	
Appendix 4	Analysis of Top 14 Organisations	
Appendix 5	Analysis of Funding as a Percentage of Total Income and Training Budget	
Appendix 6	Analysis of Funding Blocks	

REVIEW OF DHSSPS TRAINING SUPPORT FUNDING PROGRAMME FOR SOCIAL CARE VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS

SECTION 1

Introduction

- 1.1 The voluntary sector has an important role in the delivery of personal social services in Northern Ireland and in doing so works in partnership with other public services such as health, education and justice. Improving the health and well being of the people of Northern Ireland is a challenge that statutory services cannot meet alone. It is anticipated that the independent sector which includes private, voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations will play an increased role in the delivery of a range of community services in the restructured HSC. Indeed, the independent sector is particularly well placed at local level to deliver the flexible and responsive services that are needed with regard to prevention and the provision of continuity care. To this end a regional strategic commissioning framework¹ overseen by the Health and Social Care Board aims to ensure stimulation of a varied range of support and partnership with independent sector organisations.
- 1.2 The voluntary sector rely on a variety of funding sources that include a range of direct government funding, European funding, specific core and grant funding by DHSSPS (currently under review) and contracts and service level agreements with statutory HSC organisations. Other government departments which support voluntary sector organisations, including training activity, are DSD (who have an overarching remit for the voluntary sector); DETI (social economy remit) and DE and DEL (education and workforce skills respectively).
- 1.3 Recent research completed by NICVA on behalf of the Sector Skills Councils² referenced the most significant challenges facing voluntary organisations, and this included the funding required to cover core projects, and the amount of funding also tied up in specific projects. The report also pointed to the limited resources available for the skills and development of staff within many voluntary organisations.
- 1.4 The voluntary sector has also grown significantly. It is characterised by small to medium sized organisations with some 56%³ of organisations having a significant overlap of functions (i.e. social care, health, justice or housing within one organisation). 18% of voluntary sector organisations with a predominately social care function can be categorised as 'large', ie a

¹ MIPB Paper: Procurement of Social Care – Voluntary and Community Sector. (DHSSPS)

² Northern Ireland Voluntary and Community Sector Skills Survey 2008 (NICVA)

³ NICVA *ibid*

workforce of over 25 employees⁴. It is estimated that approximately 11,000⁵) are employed in voluntary organisations providing a social care service of some nature.

Brief Overview of the DHSSPS Training Support Programme

- 1.5 Article 44 of the Health and Personal Social Services (Northern Ireland) Order 1972 and Article 14 of the Health and Personal Social Services Act (NI) 2001 allows support for the training of persons employed in the HPSS in Northern Ireland or an approved voluntary organisation. The DHSSPS introduced funding support for training of the social care workforce in the voluntary sector under this legislation in the early 1990s linked to the qualification targets in the first PSS Training Strategy. This arrangement is unique to voluntary sector social care organisations and no comparable model exists for health care workers employed outside HSC Trusts.
- 1.6 The programme is administered by the Office of Social Services within the Department. This involves assessing bids, allocating funding and monitoring spend, activity and outputs. It has been challenging to track qualification achievement linked to this funding as achievement tends to take longer than one year and the emphasis on reporting systems has been on spend. The verification team within the Department undertake regular audits of individual allocations to organisations to ensure that funding has been administered in line with Departmental guidelines and objectives. The team have consistently experienced difficulties in tracking and linking spend, activity and outputs (i.e. qualification achievement) through organisations' reporting systems.
- 1.7 The budget for the training support programme is capped (maximum £400,000) and has supported on average 30 voluntary organisations annually. This is a small percentage of the total number of voluntary organisations providing social care services. Funding is proportionate to the size of the organisation which means larger organisations are eligible for a greater proportion of funding. Funding is additional to the investment in training which each voluntary organisation provides from within its own resources.
- 1.8 There has been significant investment for over almost 20 years to support qualification achievement of social care workers in voluntary organisations. Data on the qualification profile of the social care workforce within the voluntary sector suggests that while there has been some improvement, the qualification profile generally remains low. This is partially attributed to the nature and profile of the workforce (predominantly female and part-time) and the reportedly high turnover of staff. Anecdotally, it has also been reported that staff achieving qualifications in the voluntary sector have used these as a passport to gain employment in the statutory sector which has better terms and conditions.

⁴ NICVA *ibid*

⁵ PSS Development and Training Strategy 2006 – 2016

SECTION 2

Rationale and objectives for a review of the training support programme

2.1 The scheme has been running for almost 20 years and has never been reviewed. The funding provided through the training support programme aimed to support the implementation of PSS Training Strategy and was therefore targeted at improving the qualification profile of the social care workforce as one way of improving standards and quality of services which was a central theme of these strategies in the 1990s.

2.2 There have been a number of significant developments in the HSC system over the last 10 years which have changed organisational and structural arrangements within the HSC system as well as arrangements to ensure the quality and standard of social care provision. These are summarised as follows:

- the reform of public administration has changed the organisational and structural arrangements within HSC and the respective roles and responsibilities of different bodies. The Department's role is to set strategic direction, develop policy and legislation and set standards. The HSCB along with the PHA and the LCGs are responsible for planning and commissioning of HSC services. HSC Trusts are responsible for the provision of health and social care in local areas. As well as providing services directly they also procure health and social care services from voluntary, community and private organisations to meet local needs;
- the Northern Ireland Social Care Council (NISCC) was established in 2001. It sets standards of conduct and training for the social care workforce. The NISCC also registers agreed groups of social care workers. People registered with the NISCC have to meet post registration and learning requirements in order to be eligible to be re-registered;
- the Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA) was established in 2004 and regulates health and social care providers against DHSSPS Care Standards, and these include;
- a new PSS Training Strategy was launched in 2006 by the DHSSPS. A central theme of this strategy is that training and whole or part qualification will be linked with registration through the NISCC PRTL requirements. The scope of the Strategy applies to statutory, voluntary and private sector social care organisations which in Northern Ireland amounts to a work force of approximately 35,000, and this includes social workers;
- NVQs are being replaced with a Qualification and Credit Framework which will facilitate a much more flexible and proportionate approach offering easier access to appropriate training for social care workers and qualification achievement;
- the private sector as a social care provider has grown significantly over the past 20 years and today makes a significant contribution to the provision of social care services alongside statutory and voluntary providers;
- Skills for Care and Development is the Sector Skills Council for the social care workforce. Its role is to identify the training needs of social care workers and to encourage the development of appropriate provision and

financial support. NISCC is a licensed partner and has been commissioned to carry out a training needs analysis of social care workers. DEL is the government department responsible for Sector Skills. DEL also provides funding to support the skills development of key work sectors of the economy including social care;

- this Review is being undertaken against the background of financial restraint, and it is recognised that there may be concerns about the potential effects of cuts in public expenditure on the voluntary sector;
- it should also be noted that the Department is currently conducting a review of voluntary sector core and project funding. A final draft paper will be available in Autumn 2010;
- the registration of the social care workforce has the potential to create difficulties for the Voluntary and Private Sector, especially with regard to recruitment and retention and currently there is a review of the probable impact of registration;
- the current position of the Department is to sustain and maintain current funding levels for training, whilst at the same time seek ways to improve value for money. However, in the current financial climate some caution is necessary as it would be foolish to consider that the current funding is guaranteed in the future;
- it may be important to consider a paper recently issued by the Department of Health in England “Building a National Care Service” which proposes a pilot of a licensing programme for social work and social care workforce, as opposed to registration.

2.3 In light of the above, it is now timely to review the rationale for the training support programme and to consider options for supporting the training and development needs of social care workers in voluntary and private organisations and make recommendations for the use of the current training support programme funding which addresses issues of equity, fairness and VFM.

Overall Aim of the Review

2.4 To review the rationale of the training support programme within the changed HSC landscape, consider options for supporting the training and development needs of social care workers in the voluntary and private sectors (voluntary, community and private sector), and make recommendations for the use and associated administration of the current training support programme funding which addresses issues of equity, fairness and VFM.

Objectives

- 2.5
- a. To review the appropriateness and equity of existing scheme in the context of the changed environment.
 - b. To review the effectiveness and efficiency of the existing funding processes in improving the qualification profile of the social care workforce

- in the voluntary social care sector, taking into account eligibility criteria, access to alternative funding streams and costs of administration.
- c. To consider options for supporting the training and development needs of workers across the voluntary and private sectors within the context of the restructured HSC system.

2.6 Methodology

- To establish a reference group to oversee the achievement of the objectives: (see **Appendix 1**);
- to conduct a desktop exercise which will examine the key features of existing funding arrangements (inputs, outputs and outcomes) over the past 5 years;
- to consult with all voluntary organisations who are currently in receipt of training support from the Department;
- to consult with a random selection of voluntary private organisations who are not in receipt of training support;
- to consult with other relevant statutory agencies regarding future funding opportunities and options;
- to provide timescales for the journey and completion of the Review.

Key Outcomes

2.7 To make recommendations on the future of:

- DHSSPS funding policy for training support in voluntary social care organisations;
- funding options for training support that will ensure equity for all social care providers in voluntary and private sectors;
- the Department's role in any new arrangements taking into account the new organisational structures, roles and responsibilities of the Department and the HSC system; and
- outline a process and timescale for implementation of the recommendations from the 2011 financial year onward.

SECTION 3

Analysis of funding arrangements for the period 2005-2010

3.1 In order to inform the Review, an analysis of funding arrangements for this period was carried out and completed during March/April 2010. Consideration of key issues such as equity, effectiveness and efficiency of funds expended, were considered to be central to the outcome of this analysis.

3.2 The financial analysis focused on the following key areas:

- the annual cost of administering the fund (2009–2010);
- the total annual funding allocation for all organisations for each of the 5 years;
- analysis of the main funding blocks;

- analysis of the top 14 organisations allocations;
- analysis of the top 14 organisations allocations as percentage of their total income and training budget.

3.3 **Costs of administration:** the total annual cost of administering the programme is estimated at approximately £10,000 (for the year 2009-2010). **Appendix 2** gives a breakdown of these costs and as indicated, most of these are attributed to EOII Grade (83 hours) equating to approximately £7,000. This cost however, is based on administering a maximum of 40 applications during the year. It should be noted that any increase in the number of applicants would lead to a corresponding increase in the cost of administration. The nature of administering the programme is seasonal, with the peak months being April/May and to a lesser extent October.

The costs of administering the programme have remained stable and constant over the 5 years period. This is as a result of the number of applications remaining at under 40 per year. It has been the practice not to advertise or publicise the availability of the programme; rather, knowledge about the programme is achieved through “word of mouth”. To consider broad and open advertising of the programme would inevitably lead to a very significant increase in the number of applications and in turn the cost of administration. Given the existing scale and scope of the programme it may be considered that the costs of administering the fund are efficient, setting this against the total fund of approximately £400,000.

3.4 **Total annual funding allocations of all organisations 2005-2010:** over the 5 years period, a total of 39 organisations received funding, with an average of 28 organisations receiving funding in each year. Of the 39 organisations, 18 were successful in all 5 years, 4 were successful in 4 years, 3 were successful in 3 years, 7 were successful in 2 years and 7 were successful in 1 year. **Appendix 3** gives detail of all the allocations given during the 5 year period. It should be noted that approximately 50% of these organisations received funding in each of the 5 years, along with a further 10% in 4 of the 5 years. Repeated successful applications are a feature of this fund and it is unusual for any application to be unsuccessful. As already indicated, this is due to the programme not being widely advertised within the sector, and also the known reliability of organisations to achieve their training objectives and to comply with the associated needs of monitoring and administration.

3.5 **An analysis of the top 14 organisations:** a further breakdown of funding allocations indicated a need to examine more closely the performances of the top 14 organisations. This was due to the fact that over the 5 year period, these 14 organisations accounted for an average of approximately 75% of total funds allocated. This analysis is given in **Appendix 4**, with variance of between 70.3% in 2009/10 to 79.7% in 2007/08. The restriction of 75% of funding to 14 organisations is a cause for concern as it would appear to indicate considerable inequity and extreme limitations in scale and scope of organisations in receipt of the fund. Additionally, TSP budget allocation is skewed towards favouring applications from larger organisations, as the training budget of these organisations would be proportionately higher than relatively smaller organisations (organisations can apply for 50% of training costs).

- 3.6 **An analysis of funding as a percentage of total income and as a percentage of training budget:** this detail is given in **Appendix 5** and is applied again to the top 14 organisations.

This analysis reveals that the OSS funding application for training represents less than 1% of their total budget (with the exception of one organisation). This clearly shows that funds given by OSS to these top 14 organisations is minimal and largely insignificant. So in respect of financial resources OSS contribution to training may be deemed to be largely unnecessary (and an analysis of these organisations' reserves may further reinforce this conclusion).

TSP funding as a percentage of the organisation's training budget reveals wide variation from 4.6% to 49.9%. It is difficult, however, to be certain that there is commonality in the formula used to calculate training budgets.

Undoubtedly, there is clear evidence that voluntary organisations access a variety of sources for training, and these include Supporting People monies, Trust contracts, legacy and other voluntary income, and funding from other Departments (eg Apprenticeship Training Programme).

- 3.7 **Analysis of funding blocks:** this is given in **Appendix 6**. Over the 5 year period most allocations were less than £5,000; however, a significant number were between £20,000 and £25,000. This is in keeping with the fact that larger organisations with larger training budgets can automatically apply and receive larger allocations.

SECTION 4

Analysis of consultation with voluntary sector organisations

- 4.1 Consultation with the sector took 2 forms – by questionnaire and by random individual consultation with organisations who had responded to the questionnaire.
- 4.2 Following consultation with NICVA, questionnaires were sent to all voluntary organisations in receipt of TSP funding (37) and a random sample of those not in receipt of funding (30).
- 4.3 With regard to the response rate, as expected, there was a high response rate from organisations currently in receipt of Training Support funding. Out of a total of 37 questionnaires issued, there were 24 returned responses. In relation to those not in receipt of Training Support, there were only 5 responses, out of a total of 30. The latter response rate would be deemed to be not unusual, given their lack of involvement in any previous Training Support funding/application.

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

4.4 Qualification awards over the past 5 years

This analysis would be consistent with expectations, as 63% of qualification awards were attributed to either NVQ 2 or 3 care level. For some organisations,

the total number of courses funded over the 5 years includes “a multiplier effect”. This is in circumstances where some organisations were able to reduce their unit costs by accessing other sources of funding and by entering into partnership agreements with other social care organisations (voluntary and statutory). As a result they were able to train more staff than they were funded for; such efficiency would need to be maintained in any future funding arrangements.

4.5 Awareness of PSS Training Strategy Funding

The main feature of this response is that as many organisations became aware of TSP funding through their own voluntary sector network as they did through information gained directly from the Department. In many ways this reflects the Department’s practice of not actively publicising the existence of this funding.

4.6 Number of times organisations have been successful in receiving funding over the past 5 years

Of the 24 organisations, 50% received funding in each of the 5 years. This corresponds with analysis given in Section 3.

4.7 Indication of why application has not been made in each of the 5 years

There were a number of reasons identified and these included: inability to source suitable trainers, use of other funding streams eg Apprenticeship NI programme, Rutledge, Joblink and People First monies, and in some instances funding was not required.

4.8 Benefits gained from receiving TSP funding

There were very strong expressions of the benefits to be derived from being awarded funding and these may be summarised as follows:

- the promotion of staff development at all levels including direct care and management;
- as a contribution towards the increasing costs of training;
- in the provision of safer and effective service linked directly to quality awards;
- in the achievement of National Training Awards;
- improved staff retention and greater motivation in the workplace; and
- to meet the requirements of regulation.

4.9 Difficulties experienced with current OSS funding arrangements

As expected, the vast majority, 18, expressed satisfaction with the current funding arrangements. Of the remainder, there was some minor concern regarding administration eg the timetabling of funding vis-à-vis training, the fund being used solely for NVQ, the need for earlier decision making regarding the success or otherwise of the application, and the need to consider a block grant instead of individual award.

4.10 **Alternative sources of Funding**

Given that TSP funding only accounts for a maximum of 50% of the training budget for any organisation, the number of other sources of funding identified is wide and varied and these include:

- The Apprenticeship Scheme (DEL) ie Rutledge;
- Organisational reserves;
- Training itemised in Service Level Agreements;
- Supporting people monies;
- European grants;
- as part of the IIP accreditation process (DEL);
- People First monies.

The wide variety of sources of funding reflects, to a large extent, how organisations have to scrape around in order to gather together a funding budget that meets the training needs of the organisation. Training remains the poor relation in any funding contract and is often the first item to be cut from a service level agreement. The notion of full cost recovery for training through any service level agreement would appear to be extremely difficult to achieve.

4.11 **Consultation with voluntary organisations**

Of those organisations who responded to the questionnaire, a random sample of individual consultations was held with 9 organisations. These included child care, mental health, learning disability, elderly and housing associations. These were revealing, not only in reinforcing the information and messages given through the responses to the questionnaires, but it also gave organisations an opportunity to explain in greater detail some of the nature of their response. The main points which were stressed included:

- TSP funding can facilitate successful coalitions/partnerships with other organisations leading to a significant reduction in the unit cost of training. In some instances it was quoted that unit costs were reduced by over 50%. Furthermore, it was expressed that by receiving TSP funding this in turn attracted other funders;
- there are numerous accounts of the very positive impact of training in improving the quality of care provided within the organisation. Not only did training make staff feel valued and appreciated but it also led to a strong ethos and culture within the organisation which reinforced the person-centeredness of services;
- associated with this were the benefits of staff retention, with staff moving through the organisation by gaining promotion;
- most organisations expressed interest in furthering partnership arrangements with other like minded organisations. This was particularly evident, though not exclusively so, in the field of learning disability where organisations can access training through one provider;
- all organisations recognised that TSP funding needs to be more accessible to the sector, in that it needs to be delivered in a way which

- allows a greater number of organisations to access training. They understood that the current arrangements are untenable on the basis that 14 organisations currently soak up just over 70% of the funding;
- on the other hand, they stressed that current funding achieved results (ie the number of successful qualifications and also the economic unit cost of training in comparison to the statutory sector) even though it was on a very limited scale. Any new arrangements would need to guarantee similar high standards which may prove difficult if funding were to be given to organisations who have a limited track record on training;
 - they all expressed concern about accessing adequate levels of funding for training. In keeping with general downward pressures, alternative sources of funding may reduce and this in turn may lead to a lowering in quality standards of care;
 - some organisations queried whether or not they would be in a position to continue to fund NVQs, because of these downward pressures; at the same time they brought to our attention that other schemes, such as the Apprenticeship Scheme, did not fit easily into their training needs requirements;
 - as an example of lower unit costs, one organisation gave the following rates:

NVQ 2 = £561 compared to a standard unit cost of £1,800

NVQ 3 = £1,057 compared to a standard unit cost of £2,080.

It should be noted however, that the above costs did not include “backfill”. This organisation is able to deliver at a lower unit costs having established a link with an HSC Trust training team. Currently the organisation has a total training budget of £150,000 for 560 staff, which equates to about £300 for each member of staff. The same organisation is involved in other consortiums in order to reduce unit costs.

SECTION 5

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

5.1 The summary of the findings gather evidence from:

- An analysis of the Training Support Programme funding arrangements for the period 2005-2010;
- An analysis of response by voluntary organisations of those both in receipt and not in receipt of funding;
- A random sample individual consultation with voluntary organisations who responded to the questionnaires.

5.2 The **effectiveness** of the Training Programme is reflected in the number of qualifications delivered through the Training Support Programme. This would show that the majority of qualifications are appropriately targeted, with the vast majority given at NVQ 2 and 3 levels. Furthermore, the impact of training is restricted not only to those organisations who receive funding, as the staff who have gained qualifications in these organisations have moved on to

further their career in voluntary organisations which have not received training support funding, and also into employment in the statutory sector. It is also noted that qualification achievement impacts directly on improving staff retention, and this in turn promotes significantly the quality of care being offered within organisations. During individual consultations, there were numerous accounts of how qualification achievement impacted directly on improving the caring culture within organisations, underpinning not only the quality of care but also the underlying principles and values of social care.

- 5.3 There are also a number of factors relating to the **efficiency** of the current administrative arrangements associated with implementing this Training Programme. On the basis of the relative small size of the total budget, approximately £400,000, the cost of administration (maximum £10,000 per annum) is efficient. This however, is based on a maximum of administering 30 organisations per annum; under current arrangements any significant increase in the number of organisations applying for, and succeeding in gaining access to the Programme, would automatically lead to a corresponding increase in the costs of administration. Another factor indicating efficiency is the individual unit cost applied to each qualification. This is not necessarily directly attributable to the programme but due instead to voluntary organisations being able to access training through consortia etc, at a relatively reduced unit cost (this is in comparison to the training for similar qualifications in the statutory sector). Additionally, the reduced unit cost is also attributable to the voluntary sector being able to access a variety of funding for training. The resultant output for many organisations is that they can provide training for more staff with the funding provided ie 'the multiplier effect'. An example of this is where a voluntary organisation has applied for funding for 10 qualifications, but is actually able to achieve 15.
- 5.4 There is no doubt therefore, that under the current arrangements there is evidence that the programme is being delivered in an effective and efficient manner, both in terms of delivery, and also in terms of the impact this has made on the quality of care provided within the voluntary sector.

There are however, significant issues of concern which would need to be addressed in taking forward a training programme in the future.

5.5 **Scale and scope**

The number of voluntary organisations which have received funding over the 5 year period is 38 in total, with an average of 28 per annum. The fact that the Training Programme is limited to such a small number of voluntary organisations is concerning, as this would leave the current arrangements open to criticism about inequities and the promotion of elitism. Indeed, of the 28 organisations in receipt of funding, the top 14 organisations receive just over 70% of the total amount of funding available. Furthermore, larger organisations are able to access a great percentage of funding as their larger training budgets, along with larger numbers of staff means that the 50% funding given by the programme is proportionately higher than that given to

smaller organisations. In effect the Programme therefore favours larger organisations who can apply for larger amounts of funding.

5.6 Income analysis

The analysis of income levels of the “top 14” organisations shows that the Training Support Funding represents a very small percentage of their total income of the organisation, and with the exception of one case, represents a very small percentage of the total amount of money which organisations spend on training. The conclusion therefore is that many of these organisations could continue to provide the training without the support from this programme. Undoubtedly, larger voluntary organisations can access a variety of sources of funding for training eg supporting people, legacy, general fundraising, Trust contracts etc. It is important to note however that in all probability these sources too, will experience downward pressures.

5.7 The need for change

It is for these reasons, and also those contained in paragraph 2.2 which identifies the rationale for the Review, that there needs to be consideration given to making changes to the current funding arrangements. On the basis that the current funding programme will continue, it is however, vital to ensure that future arrangements consider the following:

- that under any new arrangements the programme is well known and easily accessible to the majority of voluntary, community and private sector organisations (the voluntary and private sectors);
- that the costs of administering the programme remain proportionate to the total programme fund;
- that the future quality of training provided by employers is appropriately targeted and is regularly scrutinised;
- that consideration is given to current training arrangements within the private sector, and in turn there is clear separation and division between social care and nurse training, including other aspects of health care;
- that future training arrangements not only target basic induction standards (NISCC) but also there should be consideration given to the variety of specialist basic training required by many organisations in the voluntary and private sectors.

SECTION 6

OPTION APPRAISAL

The option appraisal is set within the context of the **summary of the findings** given in Section 5. For the purposes of the appraisal, there are 6 options identified, with the sixth option – **the Combined Model – being the preferred.**

The options are as follows.

6.1 **Do Nothing**

Whilst there is evidence of elements of effectiveness and efficiency in relation to the way the current programme is administered (and this is highly valued by recipients), the overwhelming difficulty, is that the current programme only reaches a very small percentage of voluntary sector organisations (and in addition it does not currently attend to the needs of the private sector). Furthermore, smaller organisations are disadvantaged, as larger organisations receive a disproportionate percentage of the total fund available, due to the larger size of their training budget and the policy of funding up to a maximum of 50% of these costs. Additionally, the analysis of the top 14 organisations indicates that TSP funding represents less than .5% of their total income and is therefore largely insignificant. This option therefore is unacceptable of consideration.

6.2. **Expand Existing Scheme**

Within current administrative arrangements consideration of this option would appear untenable, as any open publicity about the availability of the fund would in all probability lead to a significant increase in the number of applications from the sector. This in turn would automatically increase administrative costs to a point that they would be disproportionate to the size of the fund being administered (and in the current environment, the fund will not experience any increase). Currently the fund is approximately £400,000, and this is efficiently managed with administrative costs being approximately £10,000. Any significant shift in this balance ie the fund and the costs of administration, would be unacceptable. It would appear therefore that consideration of this option is unacceptable.

6.3. **To distribute and administer the fund to and within each Trust**

An early consideration was that TSP funding could be granted towards the appointment of training officers to each Trust. The major difficulty identified with this proposal was that, in all probability, most of the current funding available for training would in fact go towards the costs of the appointment of training officers.

After further deliberation, it was concluded that instead of the training officers, an Administration Officer (part-time) could be appointed within each Trust and they would be attached to each of the Trust's training units. In adopting this suggestion, it was considered that the costs of these administrative posts would only account for approximately half the value of the total fund, therefore reserving the other half for training purposes. Again however, this was deemed to be unsatisfactory as a 50% reduction in funds directly targeted at training would severely curtail and reduce training funds to a level that would be considered inadequate and uneconomic.

6.4. To fund training through consortia

The key feature of this option is that the formation of consortia would be a required condition of any funding application. Consortia would be composed of groups of voluntary/private sector organisations, and each consortia would be tasked with identifying the training needs of their member organisations. Those training needs that are identified would be directly targeted at the requirements of the organisations to fulfil contracts with Trusts.

As such training would underpin the required knowledge to support a new qualification framework. Additionally, the training programme would be in keeping with Departmental objectives and would enhance specific initiatives identified by the Department for the sector to fulfil. In considering this proposal the Department would retain the responsibility for the day to day administration of this option, as well as the monitoring and reviewing of the programme.

The main advantage of this model is that there is the potential for more organisations to be involved, as the formation of consortia would bring together greater numbers of organisations to access funding. However, the major disadvantage is that the formation of consortia may prove to be unstable and unreliable, as they in all probability, would not be underpinned by any constitutional requirement to remain intact. Nevertheless, it is apparent that there are some natural collaborations already occurring within the sector, which reflect very willing co-operation in working together to meet training needs; this feature needs to be supported in any future arrangements.

6.5 To fund the training associated with specific Departmental policy initiatives

- there are a number of policy initiatives being driven forward by the Department which require associated training eg in the field of adult social care, direct payments, person-centred practice, safeguarding, capacity and consent, NISAT, SVA – are just some of the current policy initiatives which would benefit from specific training;
- on the basis of this the Department would retain responsibility for administering the fund and OSS would have the specific and sole responsibility for identifying those policy initiatives that were relevant for usage by the fund;
- the fund would be available to all voluntary and private sectors organisations which could identify and deliver on such policy initiatives;
- the development of this option would undoubtedly support the Department's objectives and continue to create a sharper focus for ensuring the development of new initiatives within the voluntary and private sectors.

6.6 The Preferred Option – The Combined Model

The **Combined Model** seeks to include all the positive features of the previous options, whilst introducing new elements, especially with regard to the rationale and delivery of the programme. The key features include:

- **funding being targeted at 5 key areas:**
 - training associated with Departmental policy initiatives which would be identified and prioritised by OSS in **consultation/collaboration with HSCB**;
 - relevant QCF Level 5 HSC management qualification in line with Minimum Care Standards for Registered Managers;
 - collaborative working between OSS and relevant Agencies (including NISCC) to conduct training to meet identified key skills gaps in the social care workforce;
 - supporting NISCC post registration training and learning requirements for social care workers linked to the QCF Framework as appropriate;
 - supporting NISCC post registration training and learning requirements for social workers linked to the PQ Framework as appropriate

- **Applications would be considered from voluntary or private organisations meeting the following criteria:**
 - total annual income does not normally exceed £5m;
 - provide residential, day or domiciliary care or other specified social care service under service level agreement with Trusts and/or HSC Board;and/or
 - employment of registered social workers;
 - priority will be given to applications that support an organisation's participation in a training consortia where it can be demonstrated that this provides value for money.

- **Administration:**
 - The Department would continue to administer, monitor and review the programme;
 - contribution to agreed qualification/training costs in line with guidance;
 - no grant will exceed £10,000 in any given year, and an organisation can make no more than 3 applications in any 5 year period.

- **Advantages of this Option include:**
 - that funding would continue to be used for training purposes only;
 - the current costs of administration, and processes of administration would remain constant;
 - the training programme would be in keeping with Departmental policy objectives, and would enhance specific initiatives within the sector;

- funding would target key areas within the sector that require development eg relevant management qualifications in social care; and
- by accepting applications not only from individual organisations, but also from consortia, there is the potential that the funds available would reach a greater number of organisations; (might need changed – by supporting individual organisations participation in training consortia, the potential etc);
- the maximum ceiling of an annual income of £5m would divert funding away from larger organisations and enhance the opportunities for small organisations to be successful in their applications;
- a maximum ceiling of an award to any organisation which ensure a greater spread of money to more organisations;
- a restriction on the number of consecutive applications which ensure a greater number of organisations could access training support.

In summary, this option would ensure that voluntary and private sector organisations are supported to respond to Departmental policy initiatives, whilst at the same time improving the knowledge and skills base of the social care workforce. It would also address the need to redistribute funding to smaller organisations, and also to reach a greater number of organisations.

SECTION 7

RECOMMENDATIONS

This Review was asked to make recommendations on the future of:

- DHSSPS funding policy for training support in voluntary social care organisations;
- funding options for training support that will ensure equity for all social care providers in voluntary and private sectors;
- the Department's role in any new arrangements taking into account the new organisational structures, roles and responsibilities of the Department and the HSC system; and
- outline a process and timescale for implementation of the recommendations from the 2011 financial year onward.

7.1 The future of DHSSPS funding policy for training support in voluntary social care organisations

- not only does this need to be maintained, but needs also to be extended to become available to the private sector;
- training support needs to be targeted at Departmental policy initiatives and also voluntary or private organisations that are commissioned to provide social care services on behalf of the HSC Board and/or Trusts
- training needs to be targeted at supporting NISCC post registration training and learning requirements linked to relevant credit and/or qualification achievement within the new QCF framework.

7.2 Funding options will ensure equity for all social care providers

- The development of consortia in relation to the voluntary and private sector should be actively encouraged as this would enhance the opportunities for a greater number of organisations to access training support;
- the unit costs for individual staff training associated with the development of consortia, would be reduced thus creating greater efficiencies leading to opportunities for more staff to access the training;
- for any application approval, the priority of a ceiling of an annual income of £5m would ensure that applications would be received from 'smaller' organisations, thus preventing 'larger' organisations from dominating the share of the fund;
- the Department would continue to provide up to a maximum of 50% funding as a contribution towards individual staff training costs. In addition no grant will exceed £10,000 in any given year, and an organisation can make no more than 3 applications in any 5 year period. This will ensure that other sources of funding, especially from Trusts would be supported in taking forward Departmental initiatives and services commissioned by Board/Trusts.

7.3 The Department's role in these new arrangements vis-à-vis new organisational structures

- the Department would continue to administer, monitor and review the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme, whilst at the same time consider the appropriateness of the HSC Board to administer the scheme in the longer term.

7.4 Outline of process and timescale for the implementation of the recommendations

- seminar to be held on 31 January to inform all stakeholders of the findings and recommendations of the review;
- commence equality impact screening asap, and for this to be included in the above consultation;
- commence an 8 week period of consultation beginning from the date of the seminar **(subject to budget agreement)**;
- update current application guidelines as part of transitional arrangements for 2011/12.
- Detailed work on the development and introduction of new rationale, criteria and grant making procedures will be undertaken following consultation during 2011/12 with a view to implementation from 2012.

APPENDIX 1

REFERENCE GROUP

Christine Smyth, DHSSPS (Chair)

Charles Bamford, DHSSPS

Danny McCann, DHSSPS

Cathy Rice, DHSSPS

Gerardine Cunningham, NISCC

Lorraine Simmons, NISCC

Gerry Maguire, HSCB (Replaced by David Bickerstaff 13/8/10)

Una Macauley, BHSCT

Una McKernan, NICVA

COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION

Grade	Bids	Interim	End Year	Total	Cost
AA	5	-		5	300.36
EOII	34	34	15	83	6,912.62
EOI	7	5	3	15	1,374.29
SO	5	3	3	11	1,174.63
Grand Total				114	£9,761.90

APPENDIX 3

TOTAL FUNDING ALLOCATION – 2005/06 – 2009/10

	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08	2006/07	2005/06	TOTAL	Total no. of apps
1	£28,450.00	£33,200.00	£23,930.00	£44,555.00	£40,735.00	£170,870.00	5
2	£22,580.00	£29,505.00	£33,115.00	£34,718.00	£43,920.00	£163,838.00	5
3	£30,620.00	£34,295.00	£43,640.00	£21,480.00	£29,230.00	£159,265.00	5
4	£19,460.00	£19,175.00	£22,385.00	£23,500.00	£46,500.00	£131,020.00	5
5	£30,455.00	£23,615.00	£21,480.00	£27,550.00	£25,470.00	£128,570.00	5
6	£30,060.00	£21,480.00	£29,947.00	£25,465.00	£19,880.00	£126,832.00	5
7	£33,157.00	£27,365.00	£21,450.00	£21,435.00	£15,255.00	£118,662.00	5
8	£20,390.00	£19,715.00	£14,290.00	£29,602.00	£21,744.60	£105,741.60	5
9	£12,120.00	£11,320.00	£24,720.00	£23,865.00	£25,640.00	£97,665.00	5
10	£14,680.00	£8,450.00	£26,025.00	£29,379.00	£13,902.50	£92,436.50	5
11	£24,000.00	£27,160.00	£21,480.00	£9,280.00	£8,402.50	£90,322.50	5
12	£12,070.00	£17,560.00	£22,065.00	£19,095.00	£18,854.50	£89,644.50	5
13	£12,480.00	£12,480.00	£20,800.00	£19,400.00	£22,854.00	£88,014.00	5
14	£0.00	£21,600.00	£22,160.00	£20,640.00	£20,920.00	£85,320.00	4
15	£156.00	£14,960.00	£16,980.00	£15,995.00	£17,705.00	£65,796.00	5
16	£18,200.00	£15,520.00	£0.00	£13,630.00	£14,400.00	£61,750.00	4
17	£11,915.00	£9,280.00	£7,200.00	£5,400.00	£12,083.00	£45,878.00	5
18	£14,900.00	£9,280.00	£5,680.00	£9,280.00	£5,400.00	£44,540.00	5
19	£14,500.00	£12,480.00	£6,240.00	£7,810.00	£0.00	£41,030.00	4
20	£21,920.00	£13,775.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£35,695.00	2
21	£15,725.00	£10,790.00	£8,430.00	£0.00	£0.00	£34,945.00	3
22	£0.00	£15,575.00	£11,630.00	£0.00	£0.00	£27,205.00	2
23	£2,220.00	£0.00	£7,775.00	£16,970.00	£0.00	£26,965.00	3
24	£0.00	£12,480.00	£0.00	£0.00	£9,667.50	£22,147.50	2
25	£4,560.00	£4,660.00	£4,585.00	£3,400.00	£1,925.00	£19,130.00	5
26	£0.00	£7,760.00	£3,880.00	£4,160.00	£2,980.00	£18,780.00	4
27	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£12,634.25	£12,634.25	1
28	£0.00	£0.00	£7,760.00	£3,880.00	£0.00	£11,640.00	2
29	£11,640.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£11,640.00	1
30	£0.00	£0.00	£6,240.00	£1,800.00	£2,080.00	£10,120.00	3
31	£2,600.00	£2,280.00	£2,490.00	£1,250.00	£1,150.00	£9,770.00	5
32	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£9,560.00	£9,560.00	1
33	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£2,695.00	£2,351.72	£5,046.72	2
34	£0.00	£2,080.00	£0.00	£2,080.00	£0.00	£4,160.00	2
35	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£3,880.00	£0.00	£3,880.00	1
36	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£3,600.00	£0.00	£3,600.00	1
37	£1,570.00	£1,640.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£3,210.00	2
38	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£2,377.80	£2,377.80	1
39	£1,570.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	£1,570.00	1
TOTAL (39 organisations)	£411,998.00	£439,480.00	£436,377.00	£445,794.00	£447,622.37	£2,181,271.37	

ANALYSIS OF THE TOP 14 ORGANISATIONS

	2009/10		2008/09		2007/08		2006/07		2005/06		TOTAL
	Funding allocated (%of yr's total funding)	No. of cand.s. funded	Funding allocated (%of yr's total funding)	No. of cand.s. funded	Funding allocated (%of yr's total funding)	No. of cand.s. funded	Funding allocated (%of yr's total funding)	No. of cand.s. funded	Funding allocated (%of yr's total funding)	No. of cand.s. funded	
1	£28,450.00 (6.9%)	17	£33,200.00 (7.6%)	21	£23,930.00 (5.5%)	16	£44,555.00 (9.8%)	27	£40,735.00 (9.1%)	38	£170,870.00
2	£22,580.00 (5.5%)	14	£29,505.00 (6.7%)	20	£33,115.00 (7.6%)	18	£34,718.00 (7.8%)	20	£43,920.00 (9.8%)	27	£163,838.00
3	£30,620.00 (7.4%)	15	£34,295.00 (7.8%)	22	£43,640.00 (10%)	23	£21,480.00 (4.8%)	11	£29,230.00 (6.5%)	16	£159,265.00
4	£19,460.00 (4.7%)	13	£19,175.00 (4.4%)	11	£22,385.00 (5.1%)	13	£23,500.00 (5.3%)	15	£46,500.00 (10.4%)	32	£131,020.00
5	£30,455.00 (7.4%)	16	£23,615.00 (5.4%)	13	£21,480.00 (4.9%)	11	£27,550.00 (6.2%)	16	£25,470.00 (5.7%)	15	£128,570.00
6	£30,060.00 (7.3%)	14	£21,480.00 (4.9%)	11	£29,947.00 (6.9%)	12	£25,465.00 (5.7%)	19	£19,880.00 (4.4%)	18	£126,832.00
7	£33,157.00 (8%)	16	£27,365.00 (6.2%)	29	£21,450.00 (4.9%)	12	£21,435.00 (4.8%)	15	£15,255.00 (3.4%)	13	£118,662.00
8	£20,390.00 (4.9%)	11	£19,715.00 (4.5%)	13	£14,290.00 (3.3%)	10	£29,602.00 (6.6%)	13	£21,744.60 (4.6%)	15	£105,741.60
9	£12,120.00 (2.9%)	15	£11,320.00 (2.6%)	6	£24,720.00 (5.6%)	13	£23,865.00 (5.4%)	13	£25,640.00 (5.4%)	11	£97,665.00
10	£14,680.00 (3.6%)	13	£8,450.00 (1.9%)	10	£26,025.00 (6%)	11	£29,379.00 (6.6%)	9	£13,902.50 (3.1%)	61	£92,436.50
11	£24,000.00 (5.8%)	12	£27,160.00 (6.2%)	14	£21,480.00 (4.9%)	11	£9,280.00 (2.1%)	5	£8,402.50 (1.8%)	11	£90,322.50
12	£12,070.00 (2.9%)	7	£17,560.00 (4%)	9	£22,065.00 (5.1%)	13	£19,095.00 (4.3%)	11	£18,854.50 (3.9%)	11	£89,644.50
13	£12,480.00 (3%)	6	£12,480.00 (2.8%)	6	£20,800.00 (4.8%)	10	£19,400.00 (4.4%)	10	£22,854.00 (4.8%)	15	£88,014.00
14	£0.00 (0%)	0	£21,600.00 (4.9%)	12	£22,160.00 (5.1%)	12	£20,640.00 (4.6%)	11	£20,920.00 (4.7%)	16	£85,320.00
Total Group Allocation	£290,522.00		£306,920.00		£347,487.00		£349,964.00		£353,308.10		£1,648,201.10
OVERALL ALLOCATION	£411,998.00	169	£439,480.00	197	£436,377.00	185	£445,794.00	195	£447,622.37	299	£2,181,271.37
Group % of OVERALL ALLOCATION	70.3%		69.9%		79.7%		78.4%		77.6%		75.6%

ANALYSIS OF FUNDING AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL INCOME AND TRAINING BUDGET

	2009/10				
	Funding allocated (% of yr's total funding)	Organisation training budget	OSS allocation - % of org. training budget	Organisation total budget	OSS allocation - % of org. total budget
1	£28,450.00 (6.9%)	£586,232.00	4.6%	£20,129,081.00	0.14%
2	£22,580.00 (5.5%)	£180,000.00	12.5%	£6,253,554.00	0.36%
3	£30,620.00 (7.4%)	£74,571.00	41.1%	£2,846,636.00	1.1%
4	£19,460.00 (4.7%)	£178,911.00	10.9%	£6,722,854.00	0.29%
5	£30,455.00 (7.4%)	£190,950.00	15.9%	£24,800,000.00	0.12%
6	£30,060.00 (7.3%)	£101,442.00	29.6%	£3,134,358.00	0.96%
7	£33,157.00 (8%)	£89,460.00 (app.)	37.1%	£8,000,000.00 (app.)	0.41%
8	£20,390.00 (4.9%)	£148,500.00	13.7%	£6,255,000.00	0.33%
9	£12,120.00 (2.9%)	£151,000.00	8%	£4,000,000.00	0.3%
10	£14,680.00 (3.6%)	£47,000.00	31.2%	£12,107,810.00	0.12%
11	£24,000.00 (5.8%)	£133,000.00	18%	£18,500,000.00	0.13%
12	£12,070.00 (2.9%)	£55,665.00	21.7%	£2,762,307.00	0.44%
13	£12,480.00 (3%)	£25,000.00	49.9%	£7,000,000.00	0.18%
14 *(2008/09)	£0.00 (0%)	£67,210.00	32.1%	£6,400,000.00	0.34%
Total Group Allocation	£290,522.00				

ANALYSIS OF FUNDING BLOCKS

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
Less than £5,000	6	9	3	4	6
£5,000 - £9,999	4	4	7	4	0
£10,000 – £14,999	4	1	2	7	8
£15,000 - £19,999	4	4	1	5	3
£20,000 - £24,999	3	5	9	3	4
£25,000 - £29,999	3	4	2	3	1
More than £30,000	3	2	2	2	4
TOTAL NO.	27	29	26	28	26