

Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

Minutes - 24 November 2015

Attendance

Members of the Adults and Safer City Scrutiny Panel

Cllr Paula Brookfield (Chair)
Cllr Ian Claymore
Cllr Bishan Dass
Cllr Jasbinder Dehar
Cllr Barry Findlay
Cllr Rupinderjit Kaur
Cllr Lynne Moran
Cllr Patricia Patten (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Rita Potter
Cllr Daniel Warren

Employees

Deborah Breedon	Scrutiny Officer
Tony Ivko	Service Director - Older People
Ros Jervis	Service Director - Public Health and Wellbeing
Kathy Roper	Head of Young Adults Commissioning
Alison Shannon	Head of Finance

Part 1 – items open to the press and public

Item No. *Title*

- 1 Apologies**
Apologies were received on behalf of Cllrs Linda Leach, Elias Mattu and Sandra Samuels.
- 2 Declaration of Interest**
There were no declarations of interest.
- 3 Minutes of Previous Meeting**
The minutes of the previous meetings held on 22 September 2015 and 10 November 2015 were agreed and signed as correct records subject to the following amendments:

22 September 2015
Include Ros Jervis, Service Director Public Health in the attendance list and amend the spelling of Cllr Jasbinder Dehars' name on page five.

4 **Matters arising**

There were no matters arising.

5 **Draft Budget 2016/17**

Alison Shannon, Head of Finance introduced the report. She provided the savings, redesign and income generation proposals for the Adults Cabinet Portfolio and advised that the purpose of the report was to seek Panel's feedback on each of the draft budget items.

Reshaping of Older People Services:

The Head of Finance advised that further details had been provided in the 'Better Care Technology and Strengthening Support at Home' report presented to Cabinet on 22 July and 11 November. Anthony Ivko, Service Director Older People, advised that Panel that the comments arising from this Scrutiny Panels in depth scrutiny of the issue on 14 July and 10 November as pre-decision scrutiny items had informed the Cabinet decisions on both occasions.

Cllr Paula Brookfield, Chair, acknowledged the inclusion of this Panels comments and the need to move forward with the savings proposal. She indicated that there was a need for the scrutiny process to monitor the implementation of the plans to reshape older people services to manage the expectations and the implementation. The Service Director advised that meetings were arranged to meet with everyone involved in the implementation plan and give advice about any pressures and address them.

The Panel were in agreement that Cabinet should be made aware that the Adult and Safer City Scrutiny Panel will maintain overview and scrutiny of the implementation of plans and progress of the reshaping of older people services.

Restructuring of the Library Service:

The Service Director advised that no detail of this saving proposal was available at this stage and that Cabinet had requested the library restructure saving to be revisited. In response to Cllr Patricia Patterns question the Service Director confirmed that the savings proposal will have to be realised this budget year and that the details would be reported to Cabinet later in the process.

Cllr Barry Findlay voiced concerns that the savings proposal would not be involved in proper scrutiny and highlighted the need for the revised savings proposal to come before this panel to afford the Panel opportunity to scrutinise this important decision.

The Chair indicated the importance of the decision and that Panel felt strongly and were in total agreement that the revised proposal should be subject to pre-decision scrutiny. She advised that the next meeting of the panel would be 26 January 2016 and suggested that if this was not timely that a special meeting should be arranged.

Move Warstones Office Base:

The Service Director provided a summary of the proposal. He advised that options have been explored for the use of the building but that a sustainable option had not been identified. He advised that the proposal is to relocate the Assessment and Care Management Team and to support the groups to relocate from Warstones to other local community venues. He advised that commissioners have met with user

groups and they are confident that other places can be found. He indicated that as a temporary measure a Community Health team would be based here while the joint office base was being developed as part of the Better Care Plan.

Cllr Patricia Patten referred to the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) Community Offer and asked if certain areas of the Highfields School would be used for community use. She indicated that schools that have transferred into Academies were not all fulfilling the 'Community Offer' and she asked that rather than checking just one school if all schools could be checked to ensure the Community Offer is being delivered. The Service Director confirmed he would follow up the question with the Director of Education.

Cllr Barry Findlay questioned the suitability of other facilities for what volunteer groups actually need and he sought assurance that the time social workers spend on each assessment would not be reduced as a direct result of this proposal. The Service Director advised that very few people were presenting at Warstones assessment centre and that the time spent actually assessing people should not be impaired. The Service Director agreed to take this issue away and give further consideration to it.

Cllr Bishan Dass questioned whether the number of Social Workers would be reduced as a result of the proposal. The Service Director confirmed that there were no plans to reduce the number of Social Workers, he clarified that a restructure of staff had taken place in 2014 and at that time job descriptions had been changed to be more generic. He advised that discussion in meetings with Unison every six weeks had been helpful during this transformation period.

Cllr Patricia Patten suggested that further details could be gathered once the changes occur by going back to the user groups and find out who was using the facilities. She requested feedback about user groups to make sure they are still meeting following the changes and that numbers are maintained to ensure older people are included and active.

Early Achievement of existing savings proposal – Learning Disabilities Assessment and Care Management Care Packages:

The Head of Finance advised the Panel that the savings will be achieved by moving the programme for care packages forward a year. The Service Director informed the Panel that there was confidence that this was achievable through a robust programme of review, increased use of assistive technology, promoting independence, increased value for money initiatives, and increased and targeted commissioning.

Cllr Rita Potter sought assurance that the quality of care would not be affected. Kathy Roper, Head of Commissioning All Age Disabilities, clarified that the savings would have effect on the assessment work as opposed to actual care of the individual.

Cllr Patricia Patten indicated that reviewing high costs would obviously mean moving people and that she was anxious to have reassurance that friendship groups would not be disrupted. The Head of Commissioning confirmed that this was being taken into account. She advised that high risk individuals were being looked at last and

where it was beneficial to move an individual closer to home first. She clarified that some individuals could not be moved at all but that all would be risk assessed on an individual basis to determine the best course of actions for each person.

Efficiency Saving from the relocation of the Independent Living Service:

The Service Director advised that the relocation of the Independent Living Service had realised savings of £29,000 in the budget due to the reduction in rent at the new premises at Racecourse Road Industrial estate.

Drawdown of one off grants for Adults Services:

The Service Director advised that the Head of Finance had identified unused grant funding to reduce net costs of the service for 2016/17 without impacting on service delivery.

Financial Transactions and Base Budget Revisions:

Further Review of Utilisation of Public Health Funding – Community Safety, Resilience, Healthier Schools.

Ros Jervis, Service Director Public Health and Well Being, advised that the revision of budget was a result of bringing together of all staffing and running costs of services into the public health work force.

2016/17 Budget Assumptions:

The Head of Finance advised of the assumptions set out in the paper. Cllr Patricia Patten asked if the assumptions would be added to totals of Government funding and was advised that the budget growth is from the corporate funds and that there were no assumptions received from Government. In response to a question from Cllr Bishan Dass the Service Director advised that the figures presented in the budget report may have to be revised following the Chancellors budget statement on 25 November 2015.

Resolved:

That the comments of the Panel be reported to Scrutiny Board 15 December 2015.

6 Outcome of consultation on the option to move Duke Street to supported living service

Kathy Roper, Head of Commissioning All Age Disability, provided a report to inform the Scrutiny Panel of progress on the work carried out with residents and their families of Duke Street residential care home.

The Head of Commissioning advised that the report set out the costed care options appraisal for Duke Street if it was to be de-registered as a residential care home and re-registered as a supported living service. She advised that the social landlord model was not a new concept, that it would provide a better quality of life in supported living and that it was important for the staffing to remain the same to ensure the residents remain settled in their homes.

She informed the Panel that TUPE arrangements for staff were being considered to ensure a level of consistency for residents and that a lot of time has been invested with families and carers to reduce anxiety about the level of service and care for their relatives.

There followed a discussion about the risks highlighted in the options outlined in the report relating to the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguard (Dols), Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection and the revised cost model. The Service Director responded to the question 'what happens if the family does not agree with the Dols and there is a legal challenge?' He advised that the Dols does exactly what it says; there is a requirement on all people that work for the State to have proper authority; it does not take away autonomy; there is a right to restrict an individual to a living area; it is intended to protect the safety and security of the individual, but only to do the minimum. The Head of Commissioning advised that most residents in Duke Street do not have the ability to make their own decision and that staff bring together families, carers, social workers and any other appropriate person to discuss safeguarding the individual without deprivation of liberty.

In response to further questions the Head of Commissioning advised that because de-registering and re-registering is taking place the individual still has tenure of place. She clarified that even if the family objects on behalf of the individual if a best interest decision considers that Duke Street is the best place for an individual to live they will be able to stay there.

Cllr Lynne Moran asked what the difference would be in terms of finance between supported living and re-registered care home. The Head of Commissioning advised that the individual would be able to receive housing benefits, approximately £133 per week and a range of other benefits. She advised that this would not cover all costs and that the Council will have a duty of care for the individual.

Cllr Lynne Moran asked what the TUPE arrangements time period would be. The Head of Commissioning advised that it would be a twelve month period and that there would initially be a three month stand still period to determine if the employee wanted to move or not.

In response to a question from Cllr Paula Brookfield, Chair relating to the potential cost of a revamp at Duke Street the Head of Commissioning confirmed that the cost of revamp would not fall on the Council, but to the housing association.

Resolved:

1. That the Scrutiny Panel endorse the implementation of option 2, to de-register Duke Street bungalows as residential care and to change the registration to supported living with the potential of Wolverhampton Homes becoming landlord subject to further work and discussions taking place and the Council commissioning an alternative provider to deliver the care element. A period of TUPE would apply to this option.
2. That Scrutiny Panel note the indicative timelines to complete the work to move to a supported living service and maximise potential savings.

This page is intentionally left blank