

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 11 April 2013 at Committee Room C, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 20 June 2013.

Elected Members:

- * Mrs Sally Ann B Marks (Chairman)
- * Mrs Yvonna Lay (Vice-Chairman)
- * Ben Carasco
- * Mr Mel Few
- * Mrs Angela Fraser
- * Mr Tim Hall
- * Mr David Harmer
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Mrs Caroline Nichols
- * Mr Chris Pitt
- * Mrs Fiona White
- * Mr Keith Witham

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Lavinia Sealy, Chairman of the County Council
Mr David Munro, Vice Chairman of the County Council

In attendance:

Mr Michael Gosling, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health

13/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

No apologies were received.

14/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 14 FEBRUARY 2013 [Item 2]

These were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

15/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

16/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director, Adult Social Care
Anne Butler, Assistant Director for Commissioning

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A formal question was asked of Adult Social Care by Keith Witham. A revised response is attached.
2. The discussions around this question were held as a Part 2 item, as it concerned the procurement process. However, the Committee decided upon reflection that the discussions concerning this item should be a matter of public record.
3. Officers commented that the procurement process for a Welfare Benefits Advice Service had involved users and carers in examining the options. It was recognised that there were a wide range of service providers that offered benefit advice services, and that they were held in high regard. It was commented by Officers that Adult Social Care supported the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) in a variety of ways, and was keen to engage and work with partners.
4. Members expressed concerns that the process around awarding the grant had not been suitably transparent. Officers agreed to review the standing orders pertaining to financial decisions. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care commented that he had confidence in the decision by officers. It was highlighted that any expenditure of money could be scrutinised through the Directorate's budget.
5. Members raised a question as to whether the Surrey Disabled People's Partnership (SDPP) could be encouraged to work collaboratively with other organisations. Officers confirmed that this would be a consideration in the one year review of the service, and that the SDPP had expressed an enthusiasm for consortium working.

Recommendations:

- a) That the Council's financial regulations and standing orders in relation to grants to the voluntary sector be reviewed to ensure greater opportunities for Member scrutiny.
- b) That Democratic Services work with officers to ensure Part 2 items are such because they contain statutory Part 2 information, and are not simply confidential. It is suggested that items may be split between Part 1 and Part 2 to ensure the appropriate level of transparency and openness.
- c) That a revised response with Part 2 information removed be circulated and published with the minutes.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

17/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

The Committee was asked to note that one response had been received from the Cabinet Member with reference to the recommendation concerning Social Care Debt. This response was included in the Recommendations Tracker.

18/13 DIRECTOR'S UPDATE [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director, Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

- 1. The Strategic Director for Adult Social Care informed the Committee that the Rapid Improvement Event (RIE) for the Adult Services Business Process was being undertaken. It was felt that this work was positively engaging with colleagues and stakeholders across the departments, as well as on a District & Borough level. The RIE had identified issues in the assessment process, and staff were currently identifying best practice and taking ownership of the future changes. The Committee was informed that there was an intention to find a mobile solution to undertaking assessments. Actions identified by the RIE would be shared with the Select Committee following its conclusion.
- 2. The Committee was informed that a review would be undertaken of users with learning disabilities currently placed out of county.

3. The Strategic Director for Adult Social Care highlighted the first meeting of the Health & Wellbeing Board had taken place at the beginning of the month. There had also been the first meeting of the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to discuss joint commissioning. The Committee was told that officers were confident around the new arrangements.
4. Members raised a question about the interim arrangements while a new Director of Public Health was being appointed. It was confirmed that an announcement regarding these arrangements would be made in the coming month.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

19/13 ADULT SOCIAL CARE IN SURREY: SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES 2009 - 2013 [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director, Adult Social Care
Dave Sargeant, Assistant Director for Personal Care & Support
Debbie Medlock, Assistant Director for Service Delivery
John Woods, Assistant Director for Transformation
Anne Butler, Assistant Director for Commissioning

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers gave an outline of the successes and challenges faced by Adult Social Care following the Annual Performance Assessment in 2009. The Committee was informed that a particular success was felt to be the reduction in levels of staff sickness and absence.
2. Officers highlighted that co-design with carers, users and stakeholders had been central in ensuring the success of the service. In particular the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) completed in relation to savings targets was identified as a positive example of this. Also highlighted was the use of co-design in the development of a Sensory Services strategy, and the provision of lip-reading classes for those with hearing difficulties.
3. The Committee was informed that the recent Local Government Association (LGA) Peer Review had identified both the work around

the Health & Wellbeing Board and the work connected to the Public Value Review (PVR) for services for people with learning disabilities as areas of good practice within the Council. It was also highlighted that the service had been a finalist in the Redefining Quality in Adult Services category of the Management Journal Awards.

4. The Committee was told that the service was developing a more community-based approach, with greater engagement with partners and the development of Citizens' Hubs. Officers highlighted that the "Right To Control" pilot had been praised by user organisations at a regional level.
5. In regard to Personal Care and Support, it was outlined to the Committee that the number of younger people in residential care had decreased significantly. The view was expressed that the service had improved in its identification of users for whom residential care was appropriate.
6. The Committee was informed that there were now safeguarding advisors in each of the locality areas. It was also commented that transition was improving, with more Adult Social Care staff attending reviews for young people.
7. Officers outlined the increased role of Quality Assurance in the service, and the greater strategic view in identifying what needs, resources and outcomes were in place around commissioning. This was linked to the development of locality profiles jointly with the NHS, and the provision of a home from hospital service with the Red Cross. Officers commented that current work was being undertaken to ensure a consistent service in relation to this is available across the county. Members queried where the responsibility lay for a patient's care upon discharge from hospital. It was clarified that the NHS held responsibility for 30 days following any hospital discharge, and that Adult Social Care would also have a responsibility in relation to this dependent on circumstances.
8. Members highlighted concerns regarding the provision for care for patients following discharge from hospital. Officers commented that there were sometimes challenges in working with partners around hospital discharges. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care highlighted that there was an undertaking by the Health & Wellbeing Board to look at this matter over the next year, and that there were likely to be a number of incremental changes over that time.
9. The Committee questioned what measures were in place to ensure that the service was continuing to review and assess its progress. Officers commented that a peer review had just been undertaken with Buckinghamshire and that a "local account" was being developed that featured the service's Key Performance Indicators. Members commented that they would like to see the "local account" shared with the Committee in order to give an evidence-based approach to the service's successes. The Committee strongly advised that an annual peer review should replace the discontinued annual assessment inspection regime.

10. Officers highlighted the changing relationship between Adult Social Care, carers and users, and that this involved the service asking users what they could do themselves, and how would it be known that the level of care was working. It was emphasised that this was about enabling users and carers, but also about identifying areas in which cost could be reduced. The role of personal budgets was highlighted as being an integral part of this.
11. Members questioned whether Brockhurst Care Home had received a further follow up visit following the Care Quality Commission's (CQC) previous inspection. Officers commented that the CQC had not made a further inspection to date, but that the service was confident that the identified issues had been addressed.
12. Members asked officers to comment on what they felt were the key challenges faced by the service in the coming year. It was outlined that amongst these was the need to meet savings targets, the recommendations following the Dilnot report, the continuing need to manage the market and working collectively to identify where costs can be removed from both commissioned and in-house services.
13. The Committee was thanked by the Director of Adult Social Care for their role in the scrutiny of the service. The Chairman then proceeded to praise the passion and dedication of officers within Adult Social Care, and congratulated the Director of Adult Social Care on her commitment to continuous improvement.

Recommendations:

- a) That the Committee considers as key items for scrutiny:
 - i) The viability of proposals to meet the cost savings arising from the Council's 2013/14 budget;
 - ii) The need to ensure that the provider market remains strong; and
 - iii) The strength of the Council's safeguarding procedures
- b) That the Service is commended and congratulated on the work over the last four years;
- c) That the Committee will ensure it continues to be involved in the development of key strategies, such as the Self-Funder Strategy and the development of maximising social capital and will place these on its 2013/14 Work Programme; and
- d) That the Service is encouraged to continue improving in all areas, especially embedding personalisation, ensuring all service users and carers have a named practitioner and ensuring services fit the needs of service users.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

20/13 SOCIAL CARE DEBT UPDATE [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was asked to note that the issues surrounding the processes connected to Social Care debt were due to be subject to a Rapid Improvement Event (RIE). It was confirmed that the outcome of the RIE would be shared with the Committee once it had been undertaken.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

21/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee reviewed its Recommendations Tracker. There were no further comments.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

22/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]

1. It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be a private induction meeting on 23 May 2013 at 10am, and that the next public meeting of the Committee would be on 20 June 2013 at 10am.
2. Members thanked all the officers that had supported the Adult Social Care Committee, including Leah O'Donovan for her support of the Committee as Scrutiny Officer.

Meeting ended at: 12.28 pm

Chairman

WELFARE BENEFITS ADVICE GRANT

**Formal Member Question from County Councillor Keith Witham
to Adult Social Care Select Committee 11 April 2013 and Response**

Q. Would the Director set out

1. The County Council decision making and approval and scrutiny process followed regarding the contract of £500,000 for a Welfare Benefits Advice, Information and Support Service;

- The bidding process for the Welfare Benefits Advice, Information and Support Grant was considered by the Adult Leadership Team (ALT) in July and October 2012. ALT gave approval for a grant to be bid for the provision of a free, independent, confidential service to provide information, advice and support in respect of welfare benefits to all people in Surrey. This is in recognition of the impact that the Welfare Benefits Reform will have on particular sectors of the Surrey population (Adult Select Committee Report by Toni Carney, Benefits and Charging Consultancy Team Manager, Adult Social Care, May 2012) and in order to support our objective of providing free and effective information and advice to Surrey residents.
- As this is a grant the governance of the Procurement Standing Orders (PSOs) does not apply (as detailed in the Introduction to the Procurement Standing Orders Dec 2010). As detailed in the Financial Regulations 8.5 commissioned services must assure value for money for the County Council.
- Guidance on the Grant process is currently under review and by June we will have confirmation of the Grant process. Voluntary sector representatives are a part of this process. It is anticipated that this will be completed in June of this year.
- In consultation, and with advice from Procurement colleagues, the decision was taken to award a grant of one year with the option to renew for a further two years.
- The current approach for grant approvals is one which does not overburden the voluntary, community and faith sector and is informed on a case by case basis according to value and profile. The current process is being reviewed to ensure appropriate authorisations are secured in line with good practice. Additionally, dependant on value, consideration is being given to grant vs. contract.
- Because of the profile and value of the grant in this case, the decision was taken to follow best practice of the PSOs for going to market, evaluating bids and awarding the grant.
- The key processes followed were
 - Approval by ALT in July 2012
 - Co-design of the specification with the voluntary sector
 - Provider event

- Bid advertised and issued through SCC e-sourcing system
- Compliant bids were evaluated by a panel comprising council officers, carer's representative and a representative from the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People.
- Recommendation of award and endorsement by ALT February 2013.
- The bid document contained evaluation questions and scoring criteria. At the provider event bidders were walked through the process and it was emphasised that bids would only be evaluated on what was submitted.
- This level of rigour taken for the welfare benefits information and advice service was over and above that of a normal grant process in recognition of the value and profile. This process is supported as best practice by the voluntary, community and faith sector in Surrey.

2. Explain the rationale behind the decision to award the contract, including an assurance that the new Advice Service will have the infrastructure and capacity to deliver, and on what criteria the service providers will be judged;

- Bids were scored by the evaluation panel and the recommended bid - a partnership consortium led by Surrey Disabled Peoples Partnership (SDPP) - had the highest overall score.
- In total bids from three organisations were received:
 - Cherchefelle – a housing association, who provides home based care, supported living, housing support and housing management services for adults in Surrey, West Sussex and Richmond.
 - Citizens Advice Consortium Surrey – Current members of the Consortium are Surrey Welfare Rights Unit, and Citizens Advice in Ash, Camberley, Caterham and Warlingham, Epsom and Ewell, Esher and District, Guildford, Leatherhead and Dorking, Runnymede, Walton Weybridge and Hersham, Reigate and Banstead, and Waverley. Each bureau provides advice services to people in their community on a broad range of issues as well as volunteering opportunities
 - Surrey Disabled Peoples' Partnership as lead provider - A registered charity based in Woking, focusing on the rights of disabled people. They currently deliver Surrey's County wide advocacy service. In relation to this grant, they are the lead provider for a number of partner organisations: Age UK Surrey, The Youth Consortium, Deaf

Positives and SAVI. The intent was to formalise their relationship with Surrey Welfare Rights Unit for training and expert assistance on complex issues if they were successful with the bid.

- The bids were evaluated across six domains:
 - Partnerships
 - Delivery of service outputs
 - Quality assurance and monitoring outcomes
 - Access, awareness and engagement
 - Relevant experience
 - Value for money

- From the evaluation we are satisfied that the service will have the capacity and infrastructure to deliver.
- Monitoring of the service will be quarterly, involving a panel including a representative from Children's Services, Adult Social Care and services users and carers.
- Monitoring will cover a wide range of performance including:
 - the area of Surrey the referral originated from;
 - the numbers of people served ,
 - inappropriate referrals
 - timeliness of the service i.e. referral acknowledged in one working day and contact made in three working days.
 - How the service: promotes personalisation, prevention, positive experience and protection from avoidable harm

3. Explain why it was deemed appropriate to exclude Surrey Citizens Advice Bureaux from involvement in providing this Welfare Advice and Information Service, at least in part;

Overall, the successful bidder scored more highly than the other two bidders. Based on the evidence presented, the partnership and value for money domains were identified as areas of development for Surrey Citizens Advice Bureaux. Surrey CAB has been fully briefed on the outcome of its bid and reasons for non-selection.

4. How the above fits in with the Surrey Local Assistance Scheme (which does involve CAB);

This tender exercise was separate from the Surrey Local Assistance Scheme. The latter refers to the national policy to transfer funds previously held by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) to local authorities. The Scheme is replacing the DWP Crisis Loans and Community Care Grants from 1 April 2013. Three organisations are involved in the delivery of this service: The CABs are signposting and assisting applicants to complete the application form provided to Surrey County Council's Shared Services Centre. Surrey Reuse Network will be supplying household goods and recycled furniture where appropriate.

Additionally Surrey CAB is part of a Consortium of three organisations (the other two are Surrey Independent Living Council and Help and Care) which was successful in its bid to be appointed to run Healthwatch Surrey effective from 1 April 2013.

- 5. If this decision cannot now be reviewed and reconsidered, give an assurance that when the Welfare Benefits Advice Information and Support Service contract is reviewed, prior to the end of its initial 12 month term, that it will be re-tendered and that CAB involvement will be reconsidered at that time.**

As stated above, the contract will be monitored on a quarterly basis and this will allow us to have sound information on how well the contract is being delivered.

Should there be a reason to believe that the service can be delivered more effectively in another way, e.g. in partnerships with other agencies, or that the provider is not performing satisfactorily, negotiations, an improvement plan or re-bidding can be considered within the first year.

END

26 April 2013