



Personalisation proposition



**This house believes that
the personalisation
agenda is a cost cutting
exercise and will not
benefit deaf people**



A response

- **Personalisation benefits all people who require and are eligible for state funded social care**
- **It means an increase in control and an increase in choice – albeit neither of these will be absolute**
- **Local authorities in particular are frightened of allowing people real control and choice and seek means to retain control i.e. preferred provider list, costing for care tool etc.**

Conflation of ideas

Observation on Resource Allocation:

Local Authorities have been grossly over estimating the support needs of social care users for the past 10 years and all previous assessment tools were rubbish

Or

Local Authorities have been grossly over paying for social care services for the past 10 years and although unable to do anything about this directly believe that by giving social care users the 'correct' amount of funds they will make a better job of buying than they did.

Conclusion

- Don't blame personalisation for cost reductions in social care
- There would be cost reductions anyway
- The issue is about transparency and the maturity of the relationship between the state and the individual.
- There will be cuts in public expenditure and it is probably better to work these out on a person by person basis rather than indiscriminate cuts in services.