

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA



Wednesday 11th November 2009

at 4.30pm

**in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Hartlepool**

MEMBERS: ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

Councillors Atkinson, Coward, Cranney, A Marshall, Preece, Richardson, Simmons, Worthy and Young

Resident Representatives: Mary Green, Evelyn Leck and Mary Power

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. MINUTES**
 - 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 2nd November 2009 (*to follow*)
- 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.

PLEASE NOTE: copies of the draft Allotments Development Strategy 2010 – 2015 are available to view on the Council's website at <http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/allotmentstrategy>. If you require a hard copy please contact Laura Starrs (01429) 523087.

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

No items.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

7.1 Consideration of the Draft Allotments Development Strategy 2010 – 2015:-

(a) Covering Report – *Scrutiny Support Officer; and*

(b) Presentation – *Parks and Countryside Manager*

8. ISSUES IDENTIFIED FROM FORWARD PLAN

9. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Date of next meeting –

Wednesday 13th January 2010, commencing at 4.30pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

02 November 2009

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

Present:

Councillor: Chris Simmons (In the Chair)

Councillors: Ann Marshall and Carl Richardson

Resident Representatives: Mary Power

Also Present: Nicola Bailey, Director of Child and Adult Services
Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer
Jo Wilson, Democratic Services Officer

35. Inquorate meeting

Members noted that the meeting was inquorate. However it was agreed that the budget proposals be discussed and comments taken back to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee by the Chair.

36. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Arthur Preece, Gladys Worthy and Dave Young and Resident Representative Evelyn Leck.

37. Declarations of interest by Members

None

38. Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2009

Deferred

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

None

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

None.

41. Adult and Community Services: Budget and Policy Framework Initial Consultation Proposals 2010/2011 (Scrutiny Support Officer)

The Director of Child and Adult Services presented to the forum an overarching view of the general risks facing the Child and Adult Services departmental budgets and key policy issues for the year. The Director detailed the Child and Adult Services Department's budget pressures for 2010 / 2011 relating to the provision of Adult and Community services.. Members raised the following issues:

Staff recruitment and retention – Had any consideration been given to the offer of a bursary to retain staff? The Director advised that the authority's rates of pay compared favourably with other Tees Valley authorities but others offered additional incentives such as golden handshakes. Some social workers work through agencies as they did not want to be permanently committed to one organisation or aspect of work. This has led to an increase in rates of agency worker pay which coupled with a significant increase in the number of child protection referrals since the Baby P case meant budget pressures had increased in this area.

Learning Disability transfer – Members queried how much public money was being spent on outside agencies, particularly as some of the services were provided by the council or the agencies had originally been publically owned before enforced privatisation. In adult services users had a legal right of choice over where their placements or services are provided by and funding costs were dependant on which services people chose to use

Members supported the budget pressures as reported.

Decision

That the pressures relating to the adult and community areas of service provision within the Child and Adult Services Department be supported as part of the Budget and Policy Framework initial consultation proposals for 2010/11

That the Chair report the Forum's support for the budget pressures to Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 27th November 2009 to enable a formal response to be presented to Cabinet on 14th December 2009.

The meeting concluded at 4.20pm

CHAIRMAN

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

11 November 2009



Report of: Scrutiny Support Officer

Subject: CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT ALLOTMENTS
DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY 2010 – 2015 -
COVERING REPORT

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 To provide Members with the opportunity to consider the draft Allotments Development Strategy 2010 – 2015 as part of the consultation process.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The draft Allotments Development Strategy 2010 – 2015 is currently under review. The Strategy has been presented to a number of Members Seminars and comments and views have been invited from all Allotment Associations.
- 2.2 Officers from the Department will be in attendance at today's meeting to provide an overview of the results of the consultation feedback to date. The final amended Strategy will be presented for consideration / adoption at a future Culture, Leisure and Tourism Portfolio meeting.
- 2.3 Copies of the draft Strategy are available to view on the Council's website at <http://www.hartlepool.gov.uk/allotmentstrategy> and copies have been placed in the Members Lounge (hard copies are also available on request).

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the draft Allotments Development Strategy 2010 – 2015 along with the consultation feedback, seeking clarification on any relevant issues from the officers where felt appropriate.

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 papers were referred to in preparation of this report:

- (i) Draft Allotments Development Strategy 2010 - 2015

ADULT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

14 October 2009

The meeting commenced at 4.30 pm in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor: Chris Simmons (In the Chair)

Councillors: John Coward, Ann Marshall and Carl Richardson.

Resident Representatives:
Evelyn Leck

Also Present: Jill Harrison, Assistant Director (Commissioning)
Sarah Ward, Social Care Transformation Manager
Jeanette Willis, Principal Finance Manager/Transformation Lead
Laura Starrs, Scrutiny Support Officer
Angela Hunter, Principal Democratic Services Officer

26. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Reuben Atkinson, Arthur Preece and Gladys Worthy.

27. Declarations of interest by Members

None.

28. Minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2009

Confirmed.

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

None.

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

None.

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

None.

32. Scrutiny Investigation into ‘Putting People First – The Delivery of Personalised Adult and Social Care Services *(Scrutiny Support Officer, Assistant Director of Commissioning, Social Care Transformation Manager and Principal Finance Officer/Transformation Lead)*

The Assistant Director of Commissioning gave a detailed and comprehensive presentation which gave an overview of the progress made to date, what had been achieved and the plans for the future. Members were asked to note that the Adult and Social Care Service became a transformation site in 2007 which provided national support and links to best practice via ‘In Control’.

It was highlighted that over 1400 personal budgets had been implemented resulting in positive outcomes for people including increased flexibility, choice and more personalised care packages. A staffing restructure was currently underway within the Child and Adult Services Department to reflect the impact of the new system and support progress with self directed payments and included further integration with the Primary Care Trust and Foundation Trust. The Assistant Director drew Members’ attention to a number of future challenges some of which had been resolved and some being progressed. It was noted that one of the major challenges was to change the culture of both workers and individuals to enable the best use of the resource allocation which was identified through the individual’s assessment.

A discussion ensued which included the following issues.

- (i) Where an individual employs a personal assistant/carer, what happens when that assistant/carer was ill and could not fulfil their duties? The Social Care Transformation Manager confirmed that the local authority had a duty of care to assess level of care and support required by an individual. Part of this assessment included the production of a support plan which included contingency plans for such a situation. The resources allocated were not provided until the support plan was signed off as complete and included contingencies.
- (ii) A resident representative queried the level of support provided to individuals leaving hospital after a hospital stay. The Social Care Transformation Manager indicated that there was a multi-link team

including health and social care professionals that worked closely with the hospital to ensure that an assessment was undertaken prior to an individual leaving hospital care where that was felt appropriate. This would then ensure that the appropriate level of care was provided once that individual had returned home.

- (iii) A Member questioned how the authority could ensure that individuals were getting value for money through personal commissioning as opposed to the economies of scale the local authority could achieve. The Principal Finance Manager commented that the level of cost associated with the care options available to meet the individual's needs, would be discussed with the individual as part of the planning process to create a support plan and may include either the option of direct payment or personal commissioning or a mixture of the two.
- (iv) Clarification was sought on the relationship between personalised budgets and direct payments. The Principal Finance Manager indicated that the support plan could be funded from either personal budget or direct payment as long as the outcomes for that individual were met. However, the Department's biggest challenge was to develop an IT system that would easily capture that information and work was currently being undertaken to facilitate that.
- (v) A Member sought clarification on how an individual's care was monitored to ensure that the care provided was improving that individual's life. The Social Care Transformation Manager confirmed that the Authority had a duty of care under the Community Care Act. This included a duty to monitor on a regular basis and evaluate the outcomes for individuals receiving care. The level of risk associated with each individual would determine how regularly the monitoring would take place but all cases were formally reviewed on an annual basis. Monitoring could be undertaken by telephone to that individual or in person depending on the situation and level of risk assessed. If the level of outcome for that individual was not appropriate, the social worker would speak to the providers of the care service to ascertain why.
- (vi) There was some concern about the safeguarding arrangements for the more vulnerable individuals receiving care. The Social Care Transformation Manager confirmed that social workers were aware of their responsibility towards the more vulnerable individuals and about ensuring that the individual was aware of what to expect from the very beginning of assessment. The level of monitoring would be altered accordingly, for example, more proactive monitoring would be undertaken in cases of the more vulnerable individuals to ensure that the required outcomes were being achieved.
- (vii) A Member questioned whether the implementation of direct payments and personalised budgets was costing more or less than the previous system. The Principal Finance Manager indicated that the new system placed more emphasis on how resources were used and focussed on the outcomes necessary for individuals. The Social Care Transformation Manager confirmed that individuals were, in general, very responsible with their allocated budget and

ensured that value for money was achieved whilst ensuring that their outcomes were met. It was noted that even if an individual was spending the exact same amount of money as with the previous system, a much more personalised outcome was being achieved.

- (viii) A Member sought clarification on how the monitoring was undertaken of whether individuals were receiving the full care package that had been identified through their assessment. The Social Care Transformation Manager informed Members that a panel met on a weekly basis to monitor whether the indicative allocations identified through the assessments were being utilised. Should any allocations be significantly over or under spent the case would be reviewed in line with the Authority's duty of care to ensure that individual's care needs and outcomes were being met.
- (ix) A Member questioned whether social workers had control over any allocated budgets. The Principal Finance Manager confirmed that the level of care required by an individual was not determined by the level of budget available. The assessment of care needs was undertaken and produced a points score which would then be matched against a resource allocation for that individual. The social workers would then support the individual to look at the care packages available within their resourced allocation and finalise their support plan.
- (x) Clarification was sought on what happens if the level of care provided was costed significantly less than the original resource allocation, was this funding ring-fenced in case the individual's care needs changed. The Principal Finance Manager confirmed that the indicative allocation and support plan were linked to provide a indicative personal budget. If an individual's needs changed, they could be reassessed at any time. The Social Care Transformation Manager confirmed that should the resources utilised not match the indicative allocation, it may mean that the level of care required was not being met. It was suggested that some examples of support plans be provided to Members to help them with their understanding of the process.
- (xi) A Member commented on an example of the rapid response care provided to a friend which identified the effectiveness of the system. The Social Care Transformation Manager confirmed that the rapid response care system provided care for individuals in crisis, struck down with an illness or a fall or for individuals recently discharged from hospital. This service provided short term care and should it be deemed necessary, a full assessment to cover the long term care of that individual may be undertaken after the initial period of intensive care provided by the rapid response team.
- (xii) A Member sought clarification on whether care providers were subject to a criminal records bureau (CRB) check. The Social Care Transformation Manager confirmed that the direct payments guidance stated that CRB checks cannot be enforced. However, it was a duty of the local authority to provide a facility to enable individuals to have that check carried out. The purpose of CRB

checks would be explained to the individual concerned as well as the importance of chasing references for care providers. Members were asked to note that some individuals chose to employ friends or relatives and although it was down to that individual's choice, it was the social workers responsibility to highlight the differences between personal and contractual relationships and help individuals manage this.

The representatives from Child and Adult Services were thanked for their extremely informative presentation and for answering questions from members of the Forum.

Decision

- (i) Members noted the presentation and would use the discussions that followed to inform their investigation.
- (ii) That a number of examples of support plans and resource allocations be provided for Members at a future meeting of the Forum to provide clarification on how they were linked and implemented.

33. Scrutiny Investigation into 'Putting People First' – The Delivery of Personalised Adult Social Care Services – Options for gathering alternative practice evidence from other local authorities in relation to the implementation of the 'Putting People First' agenda (Scrutiny Support Officer)

A report was submitted that provided Members with options for gathering evidence from other local authorities to illustrate alternative practice in relation to the 'Putting People First' agenda. The report highlighted two local authorities which were demonstrating alternative ways of delivering their personalised adult social care services:

- Oldham Council; and
- Manchester City Council

In order to gather this evidence, it was suggested that either a representative from each authority be invited to a future meeting of the Forum or that Members of the Forum visit one of the authorities.

It was acknowledged that Hartlepool was leading the way on the Putting People First agenda and officers had been invited to attend other authorities to share best practice. Members were unanimous in their opinion that it would be more beneficial for officers from Oldham and Manchester to be invited to attend a meeting in Hartlepool and share their working practices and experience of the Putting People First agenda.

A Member questioned why the two local authorities highlighted above had

been chosen. The Principal Finance Officer confirmed that northern region authorities had been looked at for ease of travel and Oldham had been chosen because it was a similar size Unitary authority to Hartlepool and had rolled out their programme in a similar way. In addition, Manchester was a much larger authority who took a different initial approach because they did not join up with In Control.

In addition, the Social Care Transformation Manager suggested that a representative from 'In Control' be invited to attend a meeting as this would help identify where Hartlepool fits into the national picture and provide a good overview of the national picture.

A Member suggested inviting some service users to participate and feed their views into a future meeting. The Assistant Director confirmed that a number of service users had spoken regionally and nationally on the impact of personal budgets and would give very honest feedback and responses to questions. In addition to this, the Principal Finance Manager informed Members that a Celebration Event for employees of the Adult and Social Care Teams was being held on 9 November 2009 and Members were more than welcome to attend that event to talk to employees about the implementation of the new systems. The Chair requested that details of this event be forwarded to all Members of the Forum and encouraged them to attend where practical.

Decision

- (i) That representatives from Oldham and Manchester local authorities be invited to attend a future meeting of the Forum to present evidence on how they have implemented personalised budget and direct payments and their experience with that.
- (ii) That a number of service users be invited to a future meeting of the Forum to give Members an overview of their experience in relation to the old system of paying for care and the new direct payments/personalised budget system.
- (iii) That details of the Celebration Event for Adult and Social Care Teams to be held on 9 November 2009 be forwarded to Members of the Forum.

34. Scrutiny Investigation into 'Putting People First' – The Delivery of Personalised Adult Social Care Services – Options for gathering alternative practice evidence from the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health Services *(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

Members were informed that the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health had been invited to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation into 'Putting People First – The Delivery of Personalised Adult Social Care Services'. However, due to circumstances beyond his control, Councillor Hall had submitted his apologies as he had been unavoidably delayed and was unable to attend this meeting.

The Chair confirmed that Councillor Hall will be invited to attend a future meeting of the Forum to enable him to provide evidence from a Portfolio Holder's viewpoint.

Decision

That the Portfolio Holder for Adult and Public Health be invited to a future meeting of the Forum to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation.

The meeting concluded at 6.00 pm

CHAIRMAN