



Adult Social Care Select Committee  
21 September 2011

**Social Care Change Programme Update**

**Purpose of the report:**

This report will update the Select Committee on the Social Care Change Programme project

**Introduction:**

1. This report is to update the Select Committee on progress with the transfer of residential care and support for people with learning disabilities from Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABPFT) to the independent sector, known as the Social Care Change Programme.
2. This report will provide an update since the project was last reported to the Select Committee in January 2011.

**Social Care Change Programme**

**Background**

3. The Government White Paper *Our Health Our Care Our Say* published in January 2006 outlined a new direction for the development of Community Services in the NHS in partnership with local authorities. It clearly stated that NHS campuses should be re-provided by 2010.
4. The Social Care Change Programme (SCCP) is a major project to transfer NHS campus services for people with learning disabilities from Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABFT) to the independent sector. The SABFT *Strategic Implementation Plan 2007* contained two key reasons for change in the service provision. First, ensuring quality of service provision and second, ensuring ongoing financial viability of the services.
5. There have been six main agencies involved in the SCCP: Surrey & Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (SABFT), NHS Surrey, Surrey County Council, NHS Croydon, Croydon Borough Council and NHS Wandsworth.

6. In January 2007 the SCCP covered the services provided from 51 residential care homes and 12 group homes (i.e. domiciliary / supported living) for 422 people with learning disabilities supported by 800 staff. The service costs approximately £26 million and the capital assets are valued at £42 million. Almost all the services users were placed in these services following the closure of the old long-stay hospitals.
7. It should be noted that Surrey County Council is responsible only for the provision of care and support for Surrey-funded residents in the care homes, and not the care homes or the transfer of staff from SABFT to new providers.

### **Transfer process**

8. SABFT are transferring the properties and NHS staff under *Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment)* (TUPE) legislation under the 2006 European regulations, to providers within the independent sector. The new providers will manage these services and produce proposals for improving the service. These proposals will include considering the development of supported living options.
9. Surrey County Council, along with other commissioners, will contract directly with the new providers for the individual service users for whom they are responsible. Each commissioner (including Surrey County Council) will make their own contract award for services using a common form of contract, which for this project are derived from Surrey County Council and London Borough of Croydon standard documents. All placements and future placements are made under Individual Placement Agreements for each service user.
10. SABFT will be responsible for managing the sale or transfer of the care home with each provider (where appropriate), and manage the TUPE staff transfer as a separate exercise within the project.

### **Methodology and procurement**

11. The 51 care homes are located in East Surrey and Croydon (see table below), and have been categorised into two types: Transfer Homes and Development Homes.

### **Transfer Homes**

12. These are care homes where the building and service is basically satisfactory but the overall service needs to be modernised and brought up to date. These homes are being transferred to new provider organisations as 'going concerns' i.e. the care and support for the resident, the building and the staff team are taken on by the new provider.
13. A competitive procurement exercise identified a short-list of appropriate new providers that are offered the opportunity to tender for these services. The

tender process for re-providing the Transfer Homes has been based on a phased approach i.e. small groups of care homes (two to four) being offered to the short-listed providers, with the next phase of homes only being progressed after the current phase has been concluded.

14. It should be noted that this project has sought to re-provide the care and support for service users funded by several local authorities, not just Surrey County Council.
15. The table below highlights what has been achieved in transferring care homes where Surrey County Council funded service users are located.

Care Home	No of Surrey Service Users	Status
The Heathers, Kingswood	5	Transferred 1 August 2009 to Leonard Cheshire Disability
108 Barnett Wood Lane, Ashted	5	Transferred 1 August 2009 to Leonard Cheshire Disability
17 Banstead Lane, Epsom	4	Transferred 1 August 2009 to Leonard Cheshire Disability
<b>Group Homes 12 Properties</b>	36	Transferred 1 September 2009 to Prospect
Westwinds, Reigate	8	Transferred 1 October 2009 to Leonard Cheshire Disability
Dorandene, Reigate	8	Transferred 1 October 2009 to Leonard Cheshire Disability
Ferncroft (Croydon)	2	Transferred 1 November 2009 to Odyssey Care
Rosedene, Banstead	7	Transferred 1 November 2009 to Prospect
Coulsdon Lodge, Caterham	10	Transferred 1 March 2010 to Look Ahead
Woodview Bungalow, Caterham	8	Transferred 1 August 2010 to Prospect
Redstone House, Caterham	6	Anticipated transfer December 2011
Cedarwood, Redhill	5	Anticipated transfer December 2011
The Pines, Redhill	6	Anticipated transfer December 2011
Astor House (Croydon)	6	Being discussed with LB Croydon
Downham Cottage, Epsom	3	Home to remain with SABFT
Rosewood, Charlwood	4	Home to remain with SABFT
Courthill House, Chipstead	9	Home to remain with SABFT

(Croydon) – care home located in LB of Croydon

### Development Homes

16. These are care homes where the buildings are no longer suitable for a variety of reasons e.g. in a poor decorative condition, require capital investment to modernise, are in isolated locations or have limited access to local communities.
17. These homes were dealt with in the later stages of the project as the services have not been an attractive proposition for the external care provider market. As a consequence, the re-provision has been based on identifying new services for each service user based on the individual's assessed needs then taking into account the individual's choices e.g. location, family wishes and friendship groups. Where appropriate, supported living options have been sought to provide a more personalised care and support solution in smaller accommodation units, such as bungalows. The table below highlights when homes closed and the number of Surrey County Council-funded service users re-provided for.

Care Home	No of Surrey Service Users	Status
283 Fir Tree Road	4	Closed October 2008
Croftdown (Croydon)	4	Closed October 2008
Hillcrest, Caterham	3	Closed April 2009
Lynden House (Croydon)	2	Closed August 2009
Deacon House	2	Closed October 2009
The Old Vicarage	3	Closed October 2009
Applewood, Caterham	10	Closed October 2009
21 Banstead Road South, Carshalton	5	Closed November 2010
Townend, Caterham	4	Closed November 2010
The Willows, Warlingham	8	Closed November 2010
Hermitage (Croydon)	1	Closed November 2010
Hawthorns, Caterham	2	Closed November 2010
Tudor Beech Lodge, Reigate	1	Closed March 2011
Chaldon Lodge,	2	Closed June 2011

Caterham		
Chaldon Mead, Caterham	10	Closed June 2011
Holland House, Caterham	5	Closed June 2011
Homestead, Reigate	3	Closed June 2011
Maplewood, Caterham	11	Closed June 2011
Rookview, Caterham	4	Closed June 2011
Whitehill House, Caterham	4	Closed June 2011
Inglemere <sup>(Croydon)</sup>	1	Closed June 2011
The Oaks <sup>(Croydon)</sup>	1	Closed June 2011
York House <sup>(Croydon)</sup>	1	Closed June 2011

(Croydon) – care home located in LB of Croydon

18. The outcome of the care needs assessments, individual and family wishes, involvement from professional advocates and independent mental capacity advocates has resulted in service users moving to various new locations including Sussex, Kent, Suffolk as well as new services in the local area.
19. The re-provision process was managed effectively and all service users have been successfully moved. Care Practitioners identified suitable alternative care and support for individuals that:
  - Addressed individuals needs
  - Respected service user choice
  - Maintained friendships and preferences not to live with others
  - Moved service users to supported living, where appropriate
  - Worked with families to move service users closer to them
20. Members should note that all Development Homes have now closed with the service users moved to new accommodation and care and support provision.

### **Outcomes for Individuals**

21. Advocacy Rocks (Voiceability), the self advocacy group which was set up to support the service users affected by the Social Care Change Programme have visited the Transfer Homes following their transfer to assess the process and how service users are progressing. They used a 'quality check' checklist developed and agreed with Surrey County Council to assist them with this assessment to ensure a consistent approach was maintained.
22. Formal reports were provided for the SCCP Programme Board and any issues or concerns were raised with the new care providers. Overall, feedback from Advocacy Rocks has generally been positive.
23. With regard to the service users from the Development Homes, feedback from care managers after six-week reviews has been positive. Individuals

are settling well into their new homes and accessing more individualised packages of support and exploring new social, leisure and educational opportunities.

24. Anecdotal comments from both care practitioners and advocates have, for many service users, noted significant improvement in the wellbeing of individuals. In a few cases, individuals require additional support, such as one to one hours to access the local community, and this has been agreed with care providers.

### **What is still to be completed?**

25. With regard to the remaining Transfer Homes, where there are Surrey County Council funded service users, the table above (in paragraph 15) shows the following:
- Three homes still to be transferred
  - One home where the future is yet to be determined
26. Once a home is re-provided, new providers are required to submit development plans within one year of the transfer date that establish whether residential care is the most suitable model of care for individuals. This work is in its infancy and will be progressed over the next two years.
27. As noted previously, all Development Homes have closed and the service users have moved to new accommodation and care and support arrangements. However, follow up work will be undertaken to assess how individual's services have changed to evidence whether the moves have, as is believed, improved the care and support for the individuals.

<b>Conclusions:</b>
---------------------

28. The Social Care Change Programme is drawing to a close, and while there is some residual work to be undertaken by Commissioners on the transfer homes, the development homes work has now been concluded. Care Practitioners will continue to monitor and review placements in new services and a fuller report on the outcomes for service users will be collected in due course.

### **Financial and value for money implications**

29. The SCCP has delivered an overall saving through the transfer of care and support to new providers. However, Members should note that savings are subject to change as individual's needs change (with an increased cost of care), individuals moving to new services, levels of attrition and negotiations with providers on market rates.

### **Equalities Implications**

30. To date the SCCP has proceeded with due regard to equalities implications and the provisions of Programme will apply equally to all people using the

service and create an improved service for new people entering the service at a later date.

31. All information regarding the PVR has been made available in accessible formats to all stakeholders.

### **Risk Management Implications**

32. This section provides an overview of the governance and risk management of the project. The Social Care Change Programme has been led by a dedicated project manager and supported by a small project team.
33. The project has been overseen by *The Social Care Change Programme Board*. The Board met every two months and consisted of senior managers of all partner organisations, advocates and parents/carers. These meetings approved the overall programme of work and key decisions.
34. All processes have access to the relevant Human Resource Management, Legal and Procurement advice.

### **Implications for the Council's Priorities or Community Strategy**

35. Through the re-commissioning of social care provision Surrey will promote the aims outlined in the community strategy of promoting independence, creating sustainable communities and good quality housing.
36. The proposed approach to transfer the current service to new providers who within one year prepare development plans that seeks to move towards supported living actively supports the aims of the Community Strategy and the Surrey Learning Disability Partnership Board.

### **Recommendations:**

That the Select Committee considers the detail of this update and how it wishes to be kept updated regarding the completion of the SCCP project.

### **Next steps:**

It is hoped that a further project update will return to the Select Committee during 2011/12 focusing in particular on follow-up assessments of improved outcomes for the individuals part of the SCCP.

-----

**Report contact:** Simon Laker, Senior Manager Commissioning, Learning Disabilities, Adult Social Care

**Contact details:** 020 8541 9904 / [simon.laker@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:simon.laker@surreycc.gov.uk)