

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 24 October 2013 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 5 December 2013.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Keith Witham (Chairman)
- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- A Mrs Liz Bowes
- A Mr Graham Ellwood
- * Mr Mike Goodman
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- A Mr Daniel Jenkins
- * Mr Colin Kemp
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Ms Barbara Thomson
- * Mrs Fiona White
- * Mr Richard Walsh

Ex officio Members:

Mr David Munro, Chairman of the County Council
Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Vice Chairman of the County Council

In attendance

Mr Steve Cosser, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care
Mr Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

53/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Graham Ellwood and Daniel Jenkins. There were no substitutions.

The Vice-Chairman acted as Chairman for the meeting.

54/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 5 SEPTEMBER 2013 [Item 2]

These were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

55/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

56/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A Member's question was received from Ernest Mallett. The question and response were tabled and are enclosed in these minutes. There was no supplementary question.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

57/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee noted the response from the Cabinet Member given at the Cabinet meeting on 24 September 2013 in reference to Social Capital. There were no further comments.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

58/13 DIRECTOR'S UPDATE [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Strategic Director outlined the engagement events taking place in relation to the Care Bill. It was highlighted that the Directorate had received praise at the National Children and Adult Service Conference for its financial modelling in relation to the implications of the Bill.
2. The Committee was informed that the Directorate had begun to see a positive budgetary impact as a result of the Family, Friends and Community support agenda. However, it was also commented that the NHS had indicated that a difficult winter was anticipated and that this could have an adverse effect. In order to mitigate this the Directorate had been working with the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) to strengthen shared care pathways. This included a number of changes to the hospital discharge process following a Rapid Improvement Event (RIE) over the summer.
3. The Committee was told that options were being considered for a Local Authority Trading Company in relation to the delivery of services for those with learning disabilities. It was highlighted that this work was being undertaken in collaboration with the community and carers.
4. The Strategic Director outlined Surrey's response to recent reports on fifteen minute visits in the national media. It was commented that approximately 6% of care visits were 15 minutes, and that these were intended to supplement other visits. The Committee was informed that the Directorate was working to ensure that domiciliary care commissioning provided sustainable care while also offering a fair wage to staff. It was highlighted that the domiciliary care commissioning process was being redesigned with input from service users. Members commented that the Directorate had provided a swift response to the queries around 15 minute visits and officers were thanked for the information that they provided.
5. The Committee congratulated Mary Hendrick for being short-listed for the Society Guardian Public Servant of the Year award 2013.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

The Directorate to explore the possibility of delivering a further Dilnot and Care Bill workshop to Members.

Action by: Assistant Director for Policy & Strategy

Committee Next Steps:

The Committee to receive an update on the Local Authority Trading Company options as part of the Committee's business planning workshop on 12 November 2013.

59/13 FAMILY, FRIENDS AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT - SOCIAL CAPITAL IN SURREY [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Dave Sargeant, Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support
Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
Steve Cosser, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee asked what work had been done to ensure that the Family, Friends and Community Support agenda was being delivered collaboratively with the NHS and other stakeholders. Officers outlined that the Directorate were currently planning a number of stakeholder engagement events and that these were to be undertaken at a locality level. The Committee was informed that the Directorate was working with the NHS to ensure that social care practitioners were being included as part of primary care pathways. It was highlighted that this would help emphasise the Family, Friends and Community Support approach.
2. The Committee queried what measurements were in place to ascertain whether savings were being achieved through Family, Friends and Community Support. Officers commented that the key measurement was a reduction in the average cost of care packages. It was highlighted that a greater equity of resource distribution would be another indicator of the work's success.
3. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care informed the Committee that the Directorate's spending had been less in September 2013 than in previous months.

4. It was highlighted that Members could support the Family, Friends and Community Support agenda by sharing local knowledge through the Surrey Information Point website.
5. The Committee queried how the Directorate was working with District and Borough Councils and partners. Officers commented that a series of social asset mapping exercises were being organised at a district and borough level to help identify what resources were available. It was also highlighted that social care teams were co-located with District and Borough partners to ensure a joined-up approach. Members commented that local committees could also be used in identifying local assets.
6. The Committee was informed that work was being undertaken to roll-out a model office approach across the county after a successful trial period in Woking. Officers commented that the new approach had freed up practitioner time by reducing assessment times and improving the capacity for mobile working. Members asked for clarity around the meaning of 'brave' conversations; it was stated that this referred to moving towards sign-posting a wide variety of resources and support, rather than only discussing service users' support in terms of what the local authority could provide.
7. The Committee sought reassurances around potential safeguarding risks in relation to the utilisation of Family, Friends and Community Support. Officers commented that there would be no change in the risk assessments related to an individual's support plan, and that these were designed to assess risk in an appropriate way in relation to family and friends. It was commented that from a national and historical perspective the areas of greatest safeguarding concerns related to residential care, rather than support individuals received from their family, friends or community. It was also highlighted that the Directorate did not wish to reinforce a culture where people were afraid to offer support. However, the Committee was informed that Family, Friends and Community Support would only be engaged where appropriate, and would not be used where it was felt that service users were particularly vulnerable or at risk. The Committee was told that any volunteers would be risk-assessed and overseen as per the standard safeguarding arrangements.
8. The Committee asked where savings would be made through the implementation of Friends, Family and Community Support. It was clarified by officers that this would be achieved in part by identifying savings during the assessment process, by the use of provisions where costs were reduced or free to use.
9. The Committee was informed that the intention behind Family, Friends and Community Support was not to increase the burden to service users' relatives or community. It was intended to balance responsibilities across the community as a whole and identify where resources could be accessed.

10. It was proposed that a Member Working Group be set up and report back to the Committee at a later date. The following Members volunteered to join the task group: Mike Goodman, Margaret Hicks and Fiona White.

Resolved:

- That the Committee implement a working group to track project outcomes and deliverables for the Family, Friends and Community Support agenda, to report back in March 2014.

Action by: Chairman/Democratic Services

Recommendations:

- a) That Adult Social Care should work closely with District and Borough Councils in delivering the Family, Friends and Community Support agenda.

Action by: Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

- b) That the Directorate raise the profile of the Friends, Family and Community Support agenda through Local Committees and local Councillors.

Action by: Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

The Committee will consider a report from the Friends, Family and Community Support working group in March 2014.

60/13 SUPPORTING CARERS [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Mikki Toogood, Carer Development Manager, Personal Care and Support
Shelley Head Senior Manager, Personal Care and Support
Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
Steve Cossar, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was given an update on how the Directorate worked to support carers in Surrey. Officers stated that it was important to not view carers as a resource, and to recognise that they had a right to an assessment of their support needs. The Committee expressed

disappointment regarding the number of respondents to the first statutory Carer survey, and encouraged officers to seek ways of improving this figure.

2. The Committee discussed potential barriers to engaging young carers. A question was raised as to how the Directorate liaised with schools to identify and support young carers. Officers commented that the Directorate commissioned outreach work, delivered by Surrey Young Carers; it was also highlighted that a Young Carers Strategy Group met quarterly to have oversight of the multi-agency approach to supporting young carers. Officers informed the Committee that this group included young carers and was chaired by the Chief Executive of Action for Carers. The Committee was also informed that there was a Young Carers protocol in place between Adult Social Care and Children's Services. The Directorate also funded a project worker from Action for Carers to support the transition for young carers when they reached adulthood.
3. The Committee was informed that the Young Carers' assessment form had been redesigned with the input of young carers in order to make it more accessible. Members questioned whether whole family assessments were appropriate when ascertaining young carers' needs; it was clarified by officers that a whole family assessment would always seek to obtain the views of those involved in a way that they were able to express their individual views without pressure from others.
4. The Committee expressed the view that every school should ensure that they had a school governor with responsibility for supporting young carers. The Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care offered to work with colleagues to investigate implementing this.
5. The Committee queried what efforts had been made to ensure that black and minority ethnic communities were also being engaged with. Officers outlined that the Assistant Practitioner Level 2 Carer (AP2 Carer) role had a specific responsibility around ensuring that such communities were being engaged with. It was highlighted that there were a number of informal networks that were being utilised to support these communities.
6. The Committee raised a question as to whether the Directorate would continue funding in 2014/15 for the Grant Funded Support for Carers listed in the report. It was clarified by officers that these funding arrangements would continue into 14/15.

Resolved:

- That the Committee recognises the Directorate's ongoing improvement in respect to supporting Carers.

Recommendations:

- 1) That each school has a governor responsible for supporting young carers.

Action by: Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care

- 2) That the Directorate explores ways in which it can improve the number of carers providing feedback through the Carer survey.

Action by: Carer Development Manager

Actions/further information to be provided:

The Committee to receive the Surrey Young Carers Joint Working Protocol for information.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

61/13 SOCIAL WORKER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was informed that this item had been deferred to the meeting on 5 December 2013.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

62/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee requested that an item was added to the Forward Work Programme outlining the Directorate's response to recommendations made following the Serious Case Review into the death of Gloria Foster. It was confirmed that this item would be added to the agenda for the meeting to be held on 6 March 2014.
2. The Committee requested an update on the status of the Adult Services Business Process Review Member Reference Group. It was clarified that the procurement process had been put on hold as the Directorate was now working to develop the model office, as well as working with Future Gov to develop social care applications. It was agreed that a further update would be provided and then the requirement for involvement of a Member Reference Group considered.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

Committee Next Steps:

None.

63/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The Committee noted its next meeting would be held on 5 December 2013 at 10.30am. The Chairman also asked that the Committee noted that there would be a private budget and business planning workshop for the Committee on 12 November 2013.

Meeting ended at: 12.46 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Questions to Adult Social Care Select Committee – 24 October 2013

I had understood that Care Provision by County is mandatory for some-one assessed as needing care. The current report on Care Services in the WHICH magazine for October 2013 makes clear that Councils currently choose their own eligibility threshold at which care is accepted as the Council's responsibility. In the forthcoming Care Bill it appears that Care will become mandatory at the level of assessed 'Substantial Needs' from the options of Low, Moderate, Substantial & Critical needs.

1) What is Surrey's current eligibility level at which it regards its Care provision is mandatory?

2) In the 'Which' report the hourly rate of Council charged personal care varies from £0 to £20-84p in England & Wales. One third of Councils cap the charges to the client at a weekly level. What is the current hourly rate set by Surrey and does Surrey cap any charges?

Ernest Mallett, MBE
West Molesey

Response

1) Our policy in Surrey is to provide support for people who are assessed as having 'Substantial' needs (and above, which includes Critical). All local authorities use the same eligibility framework issued by the Department of Health - guidance on eligibility criteria for adult social care, England 2010. Like Surrey, the majority of local authorities have set their eligibility criteria at Substantial

<u>Banding at 2013</u>	<u>Number of local authorities</u>
Critical	3
Substantial	130
Moderate	16
Low	3

By meeting the eligibility criteria at a certain level within the framework, it means that we have to meet an individual's t eligible identified needs. It does not mean that we have to provide services. We can meet eligible needs in a variety of ways including empowering/linking to friends family and community, reablement, telecare, occupational therapy equipment and sign posting to universal services. This will not be changed by the Care Bill.

The Care Bill introduces a national criteria which local authorities will not be able override, but the intention is this will be set to mirror 'substantial' i.e. our current level.

2) There is no single rate; the hourly rate varies depending on the charge levied by the particular provider and the type of service.

There is no cap on the maximum weekly charge. A person is assessed according to their ability to contribute towards their weekly support package. In line with the fairer charging guidance, we charge up to the total of the actual cost of the service but only where we have assessed an individual as being able to pay. In practice, for the majority of community support packages there is either no charge or this is 'capped' based on an individual's assets and/or income, rather than the cost of the service.

Margaret Hicks
Vice-Chairman – Adult Social Care Select Committee