

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Tuesday 30th September 2008

at 3.30 pm

**in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre**

MEMBERS: ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:
Councillors Atkinson, Brash, Fleet, A Marshall, McKenna, Plant, Preece, Simmons
and Worthy

Resident Representatives: Evelyn Leck and Mary Power

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ADULT AND
COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM HELD ON 27 AUGUST 2008.**
- 4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE
COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM.**

No items.

- 5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA
SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

No items.

- 6. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY
FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

No items.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool

7.1 Evidence from the Adult and Community Services Department on Initiatives and Practices:

- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (b) Verbal evidence from the Adult and Community Services Department.

7.2 Evidence from Hartlepool Primary Care Trust:

- (a) Covering report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (b) Verbal evidence from a representative from Hartlepool Primary Care Trust.

7.3 Discussion with Care Home Managers / residents / relatives:

- (a) Covering report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (b) Discussion with Care Home Managers / residents / relatives.

7.4 Feedback from the Site Visits to a selection of care homes in Hartlepool:

- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*; and
- (b) Verbal feedback from Site Visits.

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

No items.

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Date of Next Meeting – Wednesday 5 November 2008, commencing at 3.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Hartlepool.

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

27 August 2008

The meeting commenced at 3.30 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Chris Simmons (In the Chair)

Councillors: Jonathan Brash, Mary Fleet, Ann Marshall and Arthur Preece

Resident Representatives: Evelyn Leck

Also Present: Councillor Ged Hall, Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health
Bridgit Stockton, Inspector, Commission for Social Care
Inspection
Ruby Marshall, Margaret Wrenn, Sheila Jackson, Hartlepool
Health Care Group

Officers: Nicola Bailey, Director of Adult and Community Services
Charlotte Burnham, Scrutiny Manager
Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer

19. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors McKenna and Worthy.

20. Declarations of interest by Members

The Chair declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in minute numbers 25, 26 and 27.

21. Minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2008

Confirmed.

22. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum

None.

23. Consideration of request for scrutiny reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

None.

24. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents

None.

25. Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Home Provision in Hartlepool – Evidence from the Director of Adult and Community Services – Covering Report
(Scrutiny Support Officer)

As part of the Forum's ongoing investigation into the Quality of Care Home Provision in Hartlepool the Director of Adult and Community Services had been invited to attend the meeting to provide evidence in relation to its responsibilities and views on the quality of care home provision.

The Director of Adult and Community Services provided a detailed verbal presentation which included the following issues:-

- Roles and responsibilities of HBC in relation to local care home provision split into two areas strategic and individual
 - Ensure enough is known about local needs to guarantee the right kinds and level of care home provision
 - Ensure a fair cost of care is paid to enable high quality care provision
 - Enter into effective, well structured contracts with providers that ensure best value, good quality care
 - Ongoing monitoring of quality, adherence to contract terms and work in partnership with providers
 - Ongoing monitoring of individual needs and finances
 - Training support via National Training Strategy and workforce planning
 - Ensure protection of vulnerable adults
- How HBC ensure acceptable standards of care are achieved in relation to the statutory and regulatory framework covering standards of care.

- Links to contract management, use of moratoriums where concerns exist.
 - Joint working with providers and CSCI to agree action plans
 - Regular linking of soft information from care management reviews, visits, adult protection referrals, complaints, PPI forum work
- Initiatives and practices that have a measurable impact on standards of care and quality of life for residents at national, local and regional level
 - National drivers eg development of the CSCI and National Minimum Standards (NMS), Dignity in Care, local measures, local funding
 - Working closely with providers to support training and development
 - Development of the fair cost for care exercise with 4 levels of quality of accommodation
 - Strict contract monitoring arrangements, proactive approach to working with providers and zero tolerance approach to allegation of abuse
 - Homes have developed close knit relationships with relatives, open and transparent approach
 - Personalised approach to care – self assessment and support plan with family, links to key worker system

Members were advised that spending time in homes, talking to relatives, residents and staff would provide a good insight into life for individuals with various levels of support. As a result of demographic changes, the costs to the Council for residential care would continue to increase.

A lengthy discussion ensued which included the following issues:-

- (i) A Member queried what measures the Council could take to address over/under occupancy figures in care homes. The Director of Adult and Community Services advised that the Council had a responsibility to encourage the market to develop and to manage over provision, however, residents legal right of choice determined occupancy figures. Reference was made to the fair cost to care provisions and the links towards good quality standards to which the Commission for Social Care Inspection was the regulator.
- (ii) During discussions in relation to the National Minimum Standards for Older People and Adults, the Forum was advised that care homes had a duty to register with the Commission for Social Care Standards. In an attempt to improve standards of care, issues of good practice could be included in contracts.
- (iii) In response to a resident representative's suggestion that quality ratings for individual care homes be publicised to encourage improvements to standards of care, it was reported that individual

care homes had a statement of purpose and quality rating. The Council referred residents to recent inspection reports, details of which were publicly available on the Inspectorate's website. Following further discussion in relation to quality ratings and the most appropriate methods of publicising this information, the Forum suggested that the ratings be publicised on the Council's website and Hartbeat magazine and that alternative additional publicity methods be explored.

- (iv) The issue of high occupancy levels resulting in a reduction in customer choice was highlighted.
- (v) Reference was made to a complaint that had been reported relating to a bad odour in a care home in the town. Concerns were expressed regarding the length of time the care home was given to address this issue. Members were informed of the inspection process and the actions of the Council following such complaints. The representative from the Commission for Social Care advised that whilst the Inspectorate could make recommendations, there was no requirement in the regulations that stated a care home must be odour free. A resident representative requested clarification with regard to Standard 26.1 of the National Minimum Standards and Care Home Regulations, attached at Appendix A to the report, "that the premises are kept clean, hygienic and free from offensive odours." In response, the representative from the Commission for Social Care and Inspection explained that some of the main standards did not have a regulation attached to them and therefore providers were not legally obliged to adhere to the standards. Following further discussion it was suggested that a regulation to this effect be recommended to Central Government or included in local contracts.
- (vi) In response to a request for further information with regard to initiatives and procedures, the Director of Adult and Community Services agreed to provide this information under separate cover.
- (vii) The Chair expressed some concern that the responsibility for regulating standards of care was solely a matter for the Commission. The Director of Adult and Community Services reported that standards for nursing care and how well individuals' needs were being met was the Council's responsibility. The Council regularly liaised with the Inspectorate formally and informally to report any allegations of abuse or areas of concern.

Recommendation

That the evidence provided and comments of the Forum, be noted and discussions be used to assist the Forum in completing the scrutiny investigation.

26. Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool - Evidence from the Commission for Social Care Inspection – Covering Report *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

As part of the Forum's ongoing investigation into the quality of care homes provision in Hartlepool, a representative from the Commission for Social Care Inspection had been invited to attend the meeting to provide verbal evidence in relation to its responsibilities and views on the quality of care home provision.

During the course of the presentation the representative focused on the following issues:-

- Roles and responsibilities of CSCI, statutory and regulatory framework to care homes provision and examples of initiatives and practices which had a measurable impact on standards of care and quality of life for residents at a national and regional level:-
 - Statutory responsibilities
 - Inspection process to ensure standards are met
 - Types of inspections – key inspections, unannounced inspections, desk top reviews
 - Examine processes and procedures within service
 - Training and induction
 - Examine previous inspection reports/how service meets requirements
 - Investigate complaints/safeguarding matters
 - What a key inspection involves – examine environment and care plans, observe interactions, gather evidence, seek views of users, relatives, staff, nurses and GPs, provide extensive notes, prepare judgement statements to determine quality rating
 - Make good practice recommendations
 - Quality ratings process
 - Joint working and Information sharing with HBC
 - Offer advice and assistance

In addition the Forum's attention was drawn to the quality ratings and standards of care provision in Hartlepool.

Following completion of the presentation the following issues were raised:-

- (i) Members expressed concern that there were no regulations in place relating to suggested staffing levels based on the number of residents or the number of hours worked by care staff. It was considered that this may have a detrimental effect on standards of care provision. Members were advised that the regulations stated that care homes must demonstrate that suitably qualified staff were

on duty at appropriate times.

- (ii) The Forum indicated their concern regarding the possible development of a close relationship between the inspector and the care home and the loss of lay assessors as a result of the recent devolvement of the PPI Forum. Members were advised that this gap had been acknowledged and experts had recently been appointed to undertake this role. The Chair highlighted the valuable role and input from former PPI members

With regard to proposed site visits, the representative from CSCI suggested Ashfield Court in Harrogate as a suitable care home to visit which had proven high standards of care.

Recommendation

That the evidence provided and comments of the Forum, be noted and discussions be used to assist the Forum in completing the scrutiny investigation.

27. Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool - Evidence from the Portfolio Holder of Adult and Public Health – Covering Report *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

As part of the Forum's ongoing investigation into the quality of care homes provision in Hartlepool, the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health had been invited to attend the meeting to provide verbal evidence in relation to responsibilities and views on the quality of care home provision.

The Portfolio Holder referred to a recent conference on the Green Paper relating to Adult and Social Care agenda which focused on demographic changes which would be a major cost issue for the authority. With regard to quality ratings, the Portfolio Holder stated that Hartlepool had much to be proud of which was as a result of dedication of staff. It was however, considered that the communication process in terms of registering complaints/concerns could be improved.

Social Care was now a high priority and there was a significant role for Elected Members. The Portfolio Holder suggested that efforts should be made to promote independence and the links between community and leisure provision and long term care were also highlighted. The formal launch of links and the challenges ahead were noted as well as the importance of utilising the experience and knowledge of former PPI members in this process.

Discussion ensued in which the following issues were raised:-

- (i) The recent development of various types of supported housing schemes in the town, residents perception of these schemes and

measures to reduce objections and complaints from residents in this regard was discussed at length. Whilst it was suggested that proposed occupants of supported housing schemes could be invited to meet residents to reduce any concerns or fears, the Forum considered that this was not appropriate. The Portfolio Holder added that minor complaints had been received in relation to sheltered housing accommodation in the town. The importance of ensuring the correct information was provided to residents at the development stage of such schemes was emphasised.

- (ii) It was considered that low rates of pay for care staff, heavy workloads and low staff levels contributed to the high turnover of staff. It was suggested that the Forum's concerns be reported to Central Government.
- (iii) The Forum emphasised the need to continue to explore opportunities for the elderly and vulnerable adults to live independently.

Recommendation

That the evidence provided and comments of the Forum, be noted and discussions be used to assist the Forum in completing the scrutiny investigation.

28. Issues Identified from Forward Plan

None.

29. Any Other Business – Site Visits to Care Homes

The Chair encouraged Members of the Forum including former PPI members to attend the forthcoming site visits to care homes, details of which were available from the Scrutiny Support Officer.

30. Any Other Business – Future Meeting

The Chair reported that as a result of Sheraton Court Nursing Home's invitation to hold a future meeting at their premises, the possibility of holding the meeting of this Forum on 5 November 2008 at Sheraton Court was being explored.

C SIMMONS

CHAIRMAN

**ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY
FORUM**

30 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO THE QUALITY
OF CARE HOMES PROVISION IN HARTLEPOOL
– EVIDENCE FROM THE ADULT AND
COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT –
COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that the Principal Commissioning Manager has been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing inquiry into the 'Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool'.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 23 July 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently, the Principal Commissioning Manager has been invited to this meeting to provide evidence in relation to initiatives and practices which have a significant and measurable impact on standards of care and quality of life for residents.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the Principal Commissioning Manager in attendance at this meeting and seek clarification on any relevant issues, where felt appropriate.

Contact Officer: - Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool – Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 23.07.08

**ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY
FORUM**

30 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO THE QUALITY
OF CARE HOMES PROVISION IN HARTLEPOOL
– EVIDENCE FROM HARTLEPOOL PCT –
COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that representatives from Hartlepool PCT have been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing inquiry into the 'Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool'.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 23 July 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 2.2 Consequently, Hartlepool PCT has been invited to this meeting to provide evidence to the Forum in relation to its responsibilities, and views on, the quality of care homes provision.
- 2.3 During this evidence gathering session with Hartlepool PCT it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- a) What are the roles and responsibilities of the PCT in relation to care homes provision and standards of care at a local level?
 - b) What are your views on the quality of care homes provision locally, and what areas of improvement if any, would you suggest to ensure acceptable standards in care are achieved?

- c) Can you provide examples of initiatives and practices which have had a measurable impact on standards of care and quality of life for residents at a national, regional and local level?
- d) Do you have any other views/information which you feel may be useful to Members in forming their recommendations?

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of those representatives from Hartlepool PCT in attendance at this meeting in relation to the questions outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

Contact Officer: - Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523647

Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool – Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 23.07.08

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

30 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: THE QUALITY OF CARE HOMES PROVISION IN
HARTLEPOOL: DISCUSSION WITH CARE HOME
MANAGERS / RESIDENTS / RELATIVES –
COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that care home managers / residents / relatives have been invited to attend this meeting in relation to the ongoing inquiry into the 'Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool'.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 23 July 2008, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry / Sources of Evidence for this Scrutiny investigation were approved by the Forum.
- 1.2 Consequently, care home managers / residents / relatives have been invited to this meeting to discuss their views on the quality of care homes provision.
- 1.3 During this meeting it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- a) How do you ensure that the highest possible standards of care are provided and maintained?
 - b) Are residents / relatives happy with the standard of care provided?
 - c) Can you provide examples of initiatives and practices which have had a measurable impact on standards of care and quality of life for residents?

- d) Do you have any other views/information which you feel may be useful to Members in forming their recommendations?

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the care home managers / residents / relatives in attendance at this meeting in relation to the questions outlined in Section 2.3 of this report.

Contact Officer:- Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

The following background paper was used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool – Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 23.07.08

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

30 September 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: THE QUALITY OF CARE HOMES IN HARTLEPOOL:
FEEDBACK FROM SITE VISITS – COVERING
REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Forum in relation to the site visits to a selection of care homes in Hartlepool.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 As part of the evidence gathering process for the undertaking of the investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool, a selection of visits to care homes were recently attended by Members of the Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum. Appendix A outlines the general findings from these visits.
- 2.2 In line with good practice, Members of this Forum who were in attendance are requested to share / discuss their findings at today's meeting.
- 2.3 An additional visit to a care home has been arranged for 18 September 2008, therefore findings from this visit will be incorporated into Appendix A and an updated version will be circulated before the next meeting of the Forum on 05 November 2008.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum discuss their findings from the site visits as outlined in paragraph 2.1 of this report.

Contact:- Laura Starrs – Scrutiny Support Officer
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 647
Email: laura.starrs@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no background papers referred to in the preparation of this report.

Appendix A

Care Home Visits – Questions and Member's General Comments/ Findings

- a) Was the car parking satisfactory?
On the whole, yes, concerns over a busy road situated near a home.
- b) Did someone welcome you upon arrival?
Yes, but the general concerns were that visitors should be asked to show I.D and sign in/out.
- c) Did residents have a key to their own bedroom door?
**Difficult to ascertain but the majority had locks.
Should have a lock if a key can be used.**
- d) Did Staff knock before entering individual resident's rooms?
Yes (applies only to homes where information was ascertained).
- e) Were resident's able to choose what to eat at mealtimes and where to sit at mealtimes?
Homes had flexible arrangements and the majority had a choice of food, although some concerns over the lack of variety of food provided (applies only to homes where information was ascertained).
- f) Was the overall opinion of the food good?
Overall Residents were happy with the food (applies only to homes where information was ascertained).
- g) Was the communal area suitable?
Communal areas bright and nicely decorated; some rooms dull and dark; some communal areas / rooms awaiting redecoration and refurbishment; comfortable surroundings; nice personal touches; small and basic; crowded; cafeteria style dining; better facilities should be offered in communal area.
- h) Were the staff friendly/approachable?
Very attentive ; very friendly and helpful; very approachable; very informative; open; enthusiastic; and committed.
- i) Were the residents happy with the staff?
Good rapport between staff and residents and good relationships.
- j) Did the staff talk to and listen to the residents?
On the majority of occasions, yes, some with good natured banter.
- k) Were there enough staff on duty to provide quality of care?
Yes, appeared to be on the visits, although a concern that extra staff may have been on duty because of the visit.

- l) Had the staff received any training?
Yes (applies only to homes where information was ascertained).
- m) Were the residents happy with the care received?
Residents appeared very content, well cared for and happy. A concern over how some residents were left to lie in uncomfortable positions.
- n) Were activities offered to residents, if so, what activities were on offer?
A range of activities were on offer including days out; holiday; events including singers; darts; cards; snooker; gardening; outdoor activities. Concerns over the lack of use of some of the facilities.
- o) Were residents encouraged to take part in activities?
The staff said residents were encouraged to participate in activities.
- p) Was the home clean and tidy?
Overall yes, some refurbishment still ongoing at present.
- q) Were there any unpleasant smells?
Some smells
- r) Did you have the chance to speak with any of the residents family/friends? If so, what was their opinion of the care provided?
Relatives who were visiting were very happy and satisfied with the care provided.

N.B – Concerns over how residents would evacuate the building if doors locked with key pads.

7.4 (a)

