

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Wednesday, 5th November 2008

at 3.30 pm

**at Sheraton Court Care Home,
Warren Road, Hartlepool**

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. MINUTES**
 - 3.1 To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum held on 30th September 2008
- 4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**

None
- 5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

None

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

None

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool

7.1 Final Evidence Gathering Session from Key Stakeholders:

- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*;
- (b) Verbal evidence from representatives of the Authority's Adult and Community Services Department in relation to Financial Implications and Assessments; and
- (c) Verbal evidence from Care Home Managers, Residents and Relatives

**7.2 Feedback from Site Visits to a Selection of Care Homes in Hartlepool and
Ashfield Court Care Home in Harrogate:**

- (a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer*;
- (b) Verbal feedback from Site Visits to a Selection of Care Homes in Hartlepool; and
- (c) Verbal Feedback from Site Visit to Ashfield Court Care Home in Harrogate

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

**Date of Next Meeting – Wednesday 12th November 2008, commencing at 3.30 pm
in The Chamber**

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

30 September 2008

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

Present:

Councillor: Chris Simmons (In the Chair)

Councillors: Jonathan Brash, Mary Fleet, Ann Marshall, Christopher McKenna, Arthur Preece and Gladys Worthy.

Resident Representatives:
Evelyn Leck and Mary Power.

Officers: Phil Homsby, Principal Commissioning Manager
Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer
Angela Hunter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

Also present: Sue Holland, Continuing Care Manager, Hartlepool PCT
Sue Judge, Hartlepool PCT
A number of managers and representatives from various residential care homes across Hartlepool.

31. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Reuben Atkinson and LINKs members Val Crow and Ruby Marshall.

32. Declarations of interest by Members

Councillor Chris Simmons declared a non-prejudicial interest in minutes 37-40 due to a family member owning a care home in the town.

33. Minutes of the meeting held on 27 August 2008

Confirmed.

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

None.

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

None.

36 Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents

None.

37. Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool – Evidence from the Adult and Community Services Department on Initiatives and Practices *(Scrutiny Support Office)*

The Principal Commissioning Manager was in attendance to provide evidence from the Adult and Community Services Department on initiatives and practices undertaken in relation to the care home provision within Hartlepool. The Principal Commissioning Manager gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation to Members which highlighted that the key was to ensure close working with providers to ensure the most appropriate care package and support plans were in place for all residents within care homes. Members were informed that the Council's standards had been developed through the Fair Price for Care initiative which included a formula to calculate the appropriate cost for a care home with homes being graded from 1-4 (4 being the least expensive). The majority of standards were monitored and enforced through the Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) although a number of local standards were enforced through the Council's contracting arrangements.

The provision of extra/domiciliary care was calculated using outcomes formed from the individual's requirements through their support plan and was measured by consulting with the individual concerned. The Principal Commissioning Manager suggested that Members may wish to have sight of an anonymised action plan review report to show Members how actions were identified and what progress was made against those actions.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- (i) Clarification was sought on what the financial implications were for home-owners wishing to move into a residential care home? The Principal Commissioning Manager informed Members that he could not provide a detailed response at the meeting but would ensure a written response was forwarded direct to Members.
- (ii) Was the Council obliged to contract to a residential care home if the appropriate standards were met? The Principal Commissioning

Manager informed Members that if a residential care home complied with the appropriate standards the Council was obliged to contract with that care home. However, the key issue was that it was the individual's choice as to which care home to move into with varying issues affecting that choice, from preferences of a new build home to the location of a particular home.

- (iii) Clarification was sought on the issue of lower graded homes costing less and whether this resulted in lower grade homes receiving less income and being unable to afford to upgrade its facilities. The Principal Commissioning Manager informed Members that some homes had improved through the owner's capital outlay which had resulted in a higher grade being awarded and consequently improved reputation.
- (iv) A Member questioned how this grading system awarded to residential care homes across the town was publicised? The Principal Commissioning Manager informed Members that this information was provided through the CSCI website and included a full explanation of the grading system. It was suggested that enquiries be made to enable the provision of a link to that website from the Council's website.
- (v) A Manager of a care home sought clarification on whether one of the criteria for achieving a higher grade included the requirement for all rooms to have en-suite facilities. The Principal Commissioning Manager commented that this was correct.
- (vi) A discussion took place on the weekly allowance payable to residents which was currently £21 per week. The Principal Commissioning Manager indicated that this figure was prescribed by Central Government although in exceptional circumstances the Council did have some discretion to increase this amount. It was suggested that Members may wish to lobby Central Government to insist that this weekly allowance for residents be increased.
- (vii) It was noted recently that a number of people had moved to the new Hartfields development and it was questioned whether this would impact on the viability of the current residential care homes? The Principal Commissioning Manager commented that although there appeared to be very little impact at the moment, there was real potential that some homes could be at risk in the future.
- (viii) Clarification was sought on the actual weekly costs for residential care? The Principal Commissioning Manager informed Members that the weekly cost of residential care ranged from £368-£424 and that individuals had the choice of which home they wished to reside in. Individuals were never directed to a particular home by the Social Services Department on the basis of associated cost.

The Principal Commissioning Manager suggested that a representative from the Financial Assessment Team be invited to a future meeting in light of a number of the concerns relating to financial issues raised during the meeting.

The Chair thanked the Principal Commissioning Manager for his informative presentation and for answering Members questions.

Decision

- (i) The report and presentation were noted.
- (ii) That further information on what the financial implications for home-owners wishing to move into a residential care home be forwarded to Members direct for their consideration.
- (iii) That a representative from the Financial Assessment Team be invited to attend a future meeting of this Forum.

38. Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool – Evidence from Hartlepool Primary Care Trust *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

As part of the ongoing inquiry into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool, representatives from Hartlepool PCT had been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to its role and responsibility and the quality of care locally. The Continuing Care Manager informed Members that the primary role of the PCT was to ensure that appropriate nursing care was provided as required across the town with all residents in care homes having access to primary care. It was noted that continuing health care was fully funded by the PCT whilst a contribution of funding was made from the PCT towards the cost of nursing care. Members were asked to note that the PCT worked very closely with the both home owners and Social Services Department to undertake assessments and reviews of care provision were regularly to ensure that the appropriate care packages were in place.

Members were informed of a number of initiatives undertaken by the PCT including the fact that District Nurses were aligned to care homes to ensure a build up of relationships with the providers and residents. An initiative recently introduced was the End of Life Care which offers support to people to ensure they have dignity to the end of their life.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues:

- (i) It was noted that due to the close working relationship the PCT had with the care providers and social services, it was in an excellent position to assess and review the standards of residential care across the town. A manager of a care home commented that the standard of support that the care homes receive from the PCT and Social Services was excellent.
- (ii) Clarification was sought on whether there was a mutual support framework in place between care homes? The Principal Commissioning Manager informed Members that one of the Managers of a care home was looking to resurrect a former Managers' Forum in conjunction with the PCT to provide support for all managers including the formation of business continuity plans.
- (iii) A member of the public questioned if any independent assessments were undertaken of care homes? The Principal Commissioning Manager

commented that the new LINKs organisation (formerly the PPI Forum) had the power to assess health and care facilities and make comments where necessary. The Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) was a Government inspection unit which had the power to impose sanctions and de-register a care home should that become necessary. Members were informed that the Chairs of the Health Scrutiny Forum and the Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum were meeting with representatives from LINKs to discuss a reporting mechanism to the scrutiny forums to feedback information as and when appropriate.

The representatives from the PCT were thanked for their informative presentation and for answering questions during the course of the meeting.

Decision

That the presentation and subsequent discussions be noted and used to inform the investigation.

39. Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool – Discussion with Care Home Managers *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

As part of the ongoing inquiry into the Quality of Care Home Provision in Hartlepool, a number of care home managers, residents and relatives were invited to attend this meeting. A number of those present had participated in the discussions earlier in the meeting and all were thanked for their attendance and participation. However, everyone was informed that should they so wish, written submissions including their views on the quality of care homes provision throughout the town were welcome throughout this inquiry.

Decision

The report was noted.

40. Scrutiny Investigation into the Quality of Care Homes Provision in Hartlepool – Feedback from the Site Visits to a selection of care homes in Hartlepool *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

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 was recently attended by Members of the Adult and Community Services Scrutiny Forum. Attached at Appendix A was an outline of the general findings from these visits.

A resident representative who had attended the visits commented that the homes visited had been in an immaculate condition. The Chair confirmed this comment and added that the overall impression had been that the care homes

visited were all of a very high quality and some exceptionally high.

Decision

The report was noted.

41. Issues Identified from Forward Plan

None.

42. Any Other items which the Chairman considers are urgent

None.

The meeting concluded at 5:05pm.

CHAIRMAN

**ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY
FORUM**

05 November 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO THE QUALITY
OF CARE HOMES PROVISION IN HARTLEPOOL
– EVIDENCE FROM KEY STAKEHOLDERS

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that officers from the Adult and Community Services Department and Care Home Managers / residents / relatives 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, the following key stakeholders 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':
- (a) Officers from the Adult and Community Services Department will provide evidence in relation to the financial implications / assessments for people moving / planning to move into care homes; and
 - (b) Care home managers / residents / relatives have been invited to this meeting to further discuss their views on the quality of care homes provision and to participate in discussions.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the officers / Care Home Managers / residents / relatives 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

05 November 2008



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION INTO THE QUALITY OF CARE HOMES IN HARTLEPOOL:
FEEDBACK FROM SITE VISITS TO A SELECTION OF CARE HOMES IN HARTLEPOOL AND TO ASHFIELD COURT CARE HOME IN HARROGATE – COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide Members with an updated version of the feedback from the site visits to a selection of care homes in Hartlepool and to facilitate a discussion amongst Members of this Forum in relation to the site visit to Ashfield Court Care Home in Harrogate.

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.
- 2.2 An additional visit to a care home in Hartlepool was arranged for 18 September 2008 but was not included in the previous feedback report, therefore general findings from this additional visit are incorporated into **Appendix A** for Members information.
- 2.3 In addition to the local site visits, Members of this Forum also visited an out of Borough care home in Harrogate (Ashfield Court) on 13 October 2008 to compare areas of good practice as Ashfield Court was identified as an excellent practice care home by the Commission of Social Care Inspection. Therefore, Members of this Forum who were in attendance are requested to share / discuss their findings at today's meeting.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members note the findings from the site visits as outlined in paragraph 2.2 of this report.
- 3.2 That Members of the Forum discuss their findings from the site visit as outlined in paragraph 2.3 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; airy, clean and well appointed; 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; well-planned; broad airy corridors.
- h) Were the staff friendly/approachable?
Very attentive; very friendly and helpful; very approachable; very informative; open; enthusiastic; committed; and strong 'can do, will do attitude'.
- i) Were the residents happy with the staff?
Good rapport between staff and residents and good relationships; staff devoted and keen.
- 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, some higher than recommended levels, 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; holidays; events including singers; bingo; darts; cards; snooker; gardening; indoor cinema; computer room; and 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; clean and tidy but comfortable.
- 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.

