







Joint Funded Wheelchair Project

Jo Ward (OT Team Manager, LBTH Social Services)
Carol Karaca (Tower Hamlets Wheelchair Services Manager)









Reasons to consider a wheelchair for joint funding pathway:

- Client meets Wheelchair Service
- Limited space in home environment
- Prevent multiple transfers/Ease of
- Accessories of wheelchair for/to increase function/independence participation
- Posture for function -wheelchair/ seating required for eating, drinking, education, play, work

msations Funding Streams

- 1. Fully funded by one organisation 2. Various % funding agreed by
- project leads

Ordering

To be completed by Whizz-Kidz, other organisations invoiced for there % agreement

Wheelchair Joint Funding Pathway

Therapists highlight potential clients to their respective project leads, this may occur after their initial assessment

Project leads collate/discuss potential clients for Joint Funding Pathway at fortnightly meeting. Referrer to be informed of outcome of meeting

Joint Funding Pathway appropriate: Agree funding, ownership and determine if stock already available

Joint assessment undertaken if indicated , lead therapist will write up the assessment, prepare prescription

Handover by lead therapists with support from other organisations if required

Wheelchair Service exclusion criteria for joint funding but can act as a purchasing agent if wheelchair required:

- Predominantly used for static
- Not used frequently and permanently
- Used as restraint
- Used as transport aid in nursing
- In-patient/rehabilitation
- Sit to Stand chairs

Ownership

Project leads to agree ownership and ongoing maintenance

Shared Documentation

- 1. Assessment
- 2. Prescription
- 3. Handover

Version2.0 15/12/14 Judith Davis / Sibylle Daymond

What are the benefits?

- Increased choice and control for person and their family position
- Better use of space in the home small properties / overcrowding
- Reduced number of transfers needed between wheelchair and static chair
- Reduced number of adaptations less ceiling track hoists
- Reduced need for other services pain management/ physio
- Improved joined up working complex situations
- Reduced costs to wheelchair Service and Social Care

Are there any issues?

- OT's happy to refer but reluctant to hand over (straightforward) joint funded wheelchairs
- Some OT's concerned about person being sat in one seating option
- The assessed person may refuse joint funded option
- Managing expectations
- Money coming across from Social Care
- Requires regular meetings to talk through cases and agree funding

How do we decide the funding split?

Time in Wheelchair	Details	% split funding . Wheelchair Service/Social Services
100%	Wheelchair used solely for mobility	100% / 0%
100%	Wheelchair used for mobility 24/7 but added features to support social /educational needs, such as risers/trays/posture requirements to increase function/participation	80% / 20%
50%	Time is split equally between wheelchair and static seating . eg Wheelchair service would have issued a Breezy and social services issued a static seat	50% / 50%
10%	Wheelchair is only required for outdoor mobility, wheelchair service would have issued a standard basic wheelchair and social services static seating	20% / 80%
0%	Wheelchair not used outdoors, required to support living at home, eg used to transport from bedroom to living room, replaces static seating	0% / 100%

Recent Developments.....

- Relaxation of the DFG through implementation of the Regulatory Reform Order, 2008
- Developing stronger links with Education department

..... And opportunities

- DFG used to fund the riser on a wheelchair rather than to adapt a kitchen
- For education to contribute to a powered wheelchair with a riser for a student who would usually self propel e.g. to manage fatigue, be able to reach books in library, keep up with peers

Case study 1

ATH – 10 with a neurological condition.

Full time powered wheelchair

Issues:

- wheelchair bulky and younger sibling would climb on the back of it.
- outgrowing existing wheelchair
- Outgrowing Leckey Mygo (static seat). Mother has to move her about in it and she is prevented from interacting fully with her younger sibling

Past provision:

Leckey Mygo static seat	£4,000 (est.)
Ceiling Track hoist in the living room	£2,000 (est.)
Powered wheelchair	f?

What was provided:

Salsa wheelchair costing £4,000.00 (50% wheelchair service, 50% social service).

Savings:

At least £4,000 to social care. Wheelchair services saved £2,000

Benefits:

- Family moved to a purpose built wheelchair accessible property – ATH able to access her home independently.
- Interacting with her younger sibling in a more positive way (sibling cannot climb on the back of the new wheelchair).
- Reduced care input (hoisting / moving about) required from parents
- ATH can participate more fully in the wider community.

Case study 2

JK - lower spinal injury
Lives alone in an adapted property

<u>Issues:</u>

- Pain management
- Depression due to pain and social isolation
- Spending considerable time in bed

Past provision:

Riser recliner?

Powered chair - Salsa M with tilt £3475.00

What was provided:

Powered chair – Salsa M with tilt £3475.00 (50:50 split)

Powered leg raisers £ 500.00 (50:50

split)

Cost savings

Benefits:

- No longer needing physio input can do stretches the chair reduced pain
- reduced pain medication
- increased choice and control
- Increased independence and access to the community
- Voluntary role in various organisations would not have been able to do previously
- Reduced GP visits
- Pressure relief managed better.
- Improved mental well being