



Adults and Community Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - 10 March 2015

Attendance

Members of the Adults and Community Scrutiny Panel

Cllr Paula Brookfield (Chair)
Cllr Patricia Patten (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Payal Bedi
Cllr Ian Claymore
Cllr Jasbinder Dehar
Cllr Rita Potter
Cllr Bishan Dass
Cllr Barry Findlay
Cllr Stephen Simkins

Employees

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Deborah Breedon | Scrutiny Officer |
| Tony Ivko | Service Director - Older People |
| Kathy Roper | Head of Young Adults Commissioning |

Part 1 – items open to the press and public

Item No. *Title*

- 1 Apologies**
Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Linda Leach
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
There were no declarations of interest received for this meeting.
- 3 Minutes of the previous meeting (13.1.15)**

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to an amendment to minute 5 relating to Wolverhampton Citizens Advice Bureau to take account that:

Cllr Stephen Simkins expressed concerns that any policy changes or further austerity measures can increase in homelessness, numbers of looked after children and other financial strains which over time may impact on the mental health of residents and trigger an increase in demand for advice and support in the City.
- 4 Matters arising**

There were no matters arising.

5 **Exclusion of press and public**

Resolved:

That in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business as they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information falling within the paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Act set out below:]

| Item No. | Title Applicable | Paragraph |
|----------|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 6 | In House Services – Adult Social Care | 1 |

6 **In House Services - Adult Social Care**

Anthony Ivko, Service Director Older People and Kathy Roper, Commissioning Disability and Mental Health Team Manager provided a report which both informed the panel of the outcomes of budget consultation on Duke Street residential bungalows and the Community Outreach and Enablement Services, and enabled the Panel to carry out pre-decision scrutiny of the next phase of the reconfiguration of in-house services with regard to:

- Learning Disability – Duke Street Residential Bungalows
- Learning Disability – Community Outreach and Enablement Services
- Older People – Residential and Domiciliary Reablement
- Older People – Assistive Technology (Telecare and Carelink)
- Older People – Ekta

Learning Disability – Duke Street Residential Bungalows:

The Service Director advised that the report seeks permission to continue work started to engage residents of Duke Street and their families and refer back to Cabinet in June for decision. He advised that care would be changing at Duke Street, currently a Council run residential home for 20 adults with profound learning difficulties. The Service Director indicated that with the right support people with severe disability can live independently and recognised best practice supports the supported housing model.

Panel were advised that the consultation with carers had been carried out in a fair way and that Viv Griffin, Service Director Disability and Mental Health and the Team Manager had met with the carers and were continuing dialogue and keeping engaged.

Councillors indicated that Wolverhampton Homes has demonstrated best practice in a number of fields that were being discussed in relation to supporting independent living. The Team Manager indicated that a tenancy was more secure for the resident than a place in a residential care home. Councillors felt that there was a need for a mindset change, engagement with families and growing confidence with the employees.

Comments of the panel to refer to the Cabinet Member for Adults Services:

- Need to be clearer about what the difference would be for the tenants

- Why an RSL, why not Wolverhampton Homes?
- Support for the principle of promoting independence.
- Emphasised the need to continue to engage with the families of residents, acknowledging that the proposals for change will inevitably cause concern and worry.
- A comment, why externalise? Options should also consider the benefit of continuing in house provision.

Learning Disability – Community Outreach and Enablement Services

The Team Leader provided a brief summary of the outcome of consultation relating to Community outreach and enablement services. The service has provided care services for people with a learning disability living in their own homes for a number of years.

The consultation considered future options including:

- Whether to run the service through in house provider
- Externalise to a single provider
- The service to be delivered externally

Councillors questioned whether the service could be developed in house and the council tender for the services. The Panel agreed that there is a need to have accountability and to be compliant; they identified the need to evaluate the associated risks.

Comments of the panel to refer to the Cabinet Member for Adults Services:

- To include consideration of an in house provision
- Risk and Benefit analysis

Older People – Residential and Domiciliary Reablement

The Service Director advised that under the Better Care Fund (BCF) many services are being merged and a lot of services are working well with health colleagues. He advised that there are three streams under BCF, one of which is enablement. The Panel discussed how this service could be done together but differently. The Service Director advised that the before and after mapping for reablement make sense because the frontline staff will be redesignated and there will be a budget saving as a result.

The Service Director advised that there are benefits with this approach and that there are issues relating to governance; risk and benefit; in particular how do we share risk. He advised that the agreement is a 'dead hand' agreement, essentially if one partner takes their hand off the agreement, the agreement breaks. The risks on both sides are huge.

The panel referred the comments relating to residential and domiciliary reablement to the Cabinet Member for Adults Services for information.

Assistive Technology - Carelink and Telecare

Carelink and Telecare are two separate in-house services. The mobile response element for both is currently commissioned through an external market domiciliary

care organisation. A market warming exercise involving 16 providers has shown there to be a viable market place for providing integrated community alarms and telecare service.

The Service Director outlined headlines arising from the consultation, as detailed in the report. He highlighted the aspiration to develop a more joined up service, to continue to develop proposals with additional analysis, maximising all opportunities for efficiency and to explore the integration of services including the responder service where the external market contract expires on 31 May 2015. The Team Manager advised that permission is being requested to do an options appraisal and that the Better Care Fund (BCF) would be explored for potential funding. She advised that there are many advantages of assistive technology and devices in the home, particularly relating to safety and there will be a reduction in waking night staff costs as technology heat and movement sensors can ensure safety without staff in attendance. Councillors advised that the service should not be afraid of using assistive technology.

Councillors considered the need to involve the university and to look at new and cutting edge technologies such as mobile phones, telecare, GPS tracking etc; and to pass the Panel's comments on to the scrutiny review of Channel Shift at its final meeting.

Comments of the panel to refer to the Cabinet Member for Adults Services:

- The Panel are fully supportive of integrated development, 'shouldn't be afraid of using modern technologies on a large scale
- The City should be ambitious in developing assistive technology, engage with universities and NHS, aspire to be at the cutting edge
- Further work to identify the benefits for quality of life for individuals and Communities

Older People – Ekta

EKTA provides 45 day care places per day but the day case service is considered outdated and the building is not currently viable or consistent with a personalised model of care.

The Service Director advised that there had been terrific commitment from the community about Ekta but that, as the report details, there is a need to carry out a further consultation process as there are a range of models that can be looked at, including consideration of the future use of the building for instance as an asset transfer.

The Service Director indicated that Kaleidoscope, an organisation that shares the use of building, complicates the situation and means that more consideration needs to be given to the matter. The suggestion of putting Kaleidoscope and EKTA together but sitting separately was considered as more viable, as was a suggestion to explore other options to deliver the service in the community, such as the community taking over the EKTA Centre

The Panel heard that there was a lot of friends and family actively engaged in the EKTA Centre and that further consultation was the way forward.

Comments of the panel to refer to the Cabinet Member for Adults Services:

Reinforced the importance of working with the Community, families and individuals

The Service Director gave a summary of the comments to refer to the Cabinet Member and the Panel resolved:

1. To note the outcomes of consultation with regard to Learning Disability – Duke Street Residential Bungalows and Learning Disability – Community Outreach and Enablement Service
2. To note that the item is being considered as pre-decision scrutiny and will therefore not be available to call-in once the decision has been made by the Executive
3. To refer the following comments of the Adults and Community Scrutiny Panel to the Cabinet Member Adult Services to present to Cabinet 11 March 2015:

Learning Disability – Duke Street Residential Bungalows:

- Need to be clearer about what the difference would be for the tenants
- Why an RSL, why not Wolverhampton Homes?
- Support for the principle of promoting independence.
- Emphasised the need to continue to engage with the families of residents, acknowledging that the proposals for change will inevitably cause concern and worry.
- A comment, why externalise? Options should also consider the benefit of continuing in house provision.

Learning Disability – Community Outreach and Enablement Services:

- To include consideration of an in house provision
- Risk and Benefit analysis

Older People – Residential and Domiciliary Reablement:

- To note the comments relating to residential and domiciliary reablement to the Cabinet Member for Adults Services

Assistive Technology - Carelink and Telecare:

- The Panel are fully supportive of integrated development, 'shouldn't be afraid of using modern technologies on a large scale
- The City should be ambitious in developing assistive technology, engage with universities and NHS, aspire to be at the cutting edge
- Further work to identify the benefits for quality of life for individuals and Communities

Older People – Ekta:

- Reinforced the importance of working with the Community, families and individuals

General:

- There was overall a supportive response to the paper which is looking to the future rather than the past
- The new commissioned arrangements should be supported by capacity for monitoring of these contracts to ensure safe delivery of support.
- Expectation that robust governance arrangements are in place for new arrangements, with complete clarity about accountability arrangements.
- There needs to be clearer statements of the benefits of partnerships

Thanks to the Chair

The Vice-Chair thanked the Chair on behalf of the Panel for a good year of scrutiny. Councillors agreed that the range, openness and honesty of witnesses had really lifted the standard, focus and depth of scrutiny.

The Service Director thanked the Chair and Panel Members for the challenge provided by scrutiny during the year, which he advised had changed what the Service group had done and the way forward for service and policy delivery.