

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 1 May 2014 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, 26 June 2014.

**Elected Members:**

- \* Mr Keith Witham (Chairman)
- \* Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mrs Liz Bowes
- \* Mr Graham Ellwood
- \* Miss Marisa Heath
- A Mr Saj Hussain
- A Mr George Johnson
- \* 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 Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

#### **29/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Saj Hussain and George Johnson. Richard Wilson acted as a substitute for Saj Hussain.

#### **30/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 16 JANUARY 2014 & 6 MARCH 2014 [Item 2]**

These were agreed as accurate records of the meetings.

#### **31/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **32/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no questions or petitions.

#### **33/14 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]**

There were no referrals made to Cabinet at the last meeting of the Committee, so there are no responses to report.

#### **34/14 DIRECTOR'S UPDATE [Item 6]**

**Declarations of interest:** None.

**Witnesses:** Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

#### **Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Committee was informed that a peer review regarding safeguarding arrangements in Surrey had just been completed by Buckinghamshire County Council. Feedback had highlighted the calibre and commitment of front-line staff, praised the political and strategic leadership and noted the good partnership working the Council had developed. There had been no significant areas of concern, and Adult Social Care would continue to improve on any areas that had been highlighted.
2. The Committee queried whether there was confidence that abuse was not happening in any Council owned care homes. Officers commented that there could never be an absolute guarantee that abuse was not taking place, but highlighted that the safeguarding measures were designed to minimise the risk of abuse. It was commented that all care homes, both commissioned and owned by the Council, were required to be Care Quality Commission (CQC) compliant. A number of measures were highlighted as helping provide safeguarding assurances, in particular work with the Surrey Care Association to improve recruitment, retention and support for staff. Officers informed the Committee that the CQC inspection regime was changing in September 2014, and a rating system would be introduced.

3. The Committee asked whether the need to maintain the cost of commissioned services was creating a risk that the quality of care was diminishing. Officers highlighted that both commercial and quality considerations were key in commissioning services. It was highlighted that there was a number of exercises that supported a co-design process, and ensured that commissioned services were of sufficient quality.
4. The Committee was informed that the Directorate was working with health partners around closer integration through the Health & Well-Being Board. It was commented by officers that work had begun to look at how resources could be shared collectively. The Committee was told that there was a need to identify and understand different local pressures, and what resources could be pooled to create better efficiencies for both the Council and health partners. Members highlighted the role of local committees in gaining insight on particular areas and the pressures they experience. Officers commented that there was an initiative being undertaken jointly with Children, Schools and Families Directorate to ensure that social care items were on the agenda at local committee meetings.

**Recommendations:**

None.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Committee Next Steps:**

The Committee will receive the final peer review report for consideration at a future meeting.

**35/14 CABINET MEMBER PRIORITIES 2014 - 15 [Item 7]**

**Declarations of interest:** None.

**Witnesses:** Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Cabinet Member outlined his priorities for 2014-15. These included:
  - i. Staffing – The Cabinet Member outlined that discussions were being undertaken with Human Resources (HR) to develop recruitment and pay practices. It was also highlighted that there was work to identify where efficiencies could be made through providing staff with technology to support the assessment process.

- ii. Safeguarding – The Cabinet Member commented that he would be examining the complaint procedure in order to gain a better understanding of the process.
- iii. Surrey’s contract with Anchor
- iv. Surrey Choices –The Cabinet Member informed the Committee that he would be observing how the Local Authority Trading Company developed, and would consider what other opportunities existed within the Directorate to develop similar initiatives.
- v. Developing the Better Care Fund with partners
- vi. Preparation for the Care Bill – The Committee was informed that the Directorate would be looking at how the likely increase in assessments was managed, and also how the expectation of Surrey residents was managed in relation to the funding reforms set out in the legislation.
- vii. Budget – The Committee was informed that it was recognised that there were still a number of challenges related to the Family, Friends and Community Support agenda. The Cabinet Member commented that he would continue to encourage the Directorate to embed the practices identified through the Rapid Improvement Events (RIEs).

2. The Committee discussed the issue of recruitment and retention, commenting that the neighbouring London authorities made for a competitive market in terms of salaries. Officers expressed the view that retention was greatly influenced by the training available to staff. It was explained that the Directorate had supplemented the corporate recruitment process with some dedicated resources for Adult Social Care.

**Recommendations:**

None.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Committee Next Steps:**

The Committee will invite the Cabinet Member to give a further update on the progress of the priorities in six months time.

**36/14 BUDGET UPDATE [Item 8]**

**Declarations of interest:** None.

**Witnesses:** William House, Senior Principal Accountant  
Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Committee was given an outline on the adjustments to the Family, Friends & Community Support (F,F&CS) savings since the Committee received an update at its Budget Planning Workshop on 13 February 2014. Two documents were tabled at the meeting and are enclosed as appendices to these minutes.
2. The Committee queried whether there was sufficient resource to ensure staff were equipped with adequate IT provision to achieve the efficiencies through assessments and re-assessments. Officers commented that the principle of the Rapid Improvement Events (RIEs) was to simplify process, and that IT resource was an element of this. It was highlighted that there was a number of corporate initiatives around creating efficiencies through digital design and using app technology, and that the Directorate would be part of this. It was highlighted by Members that this could be a topic of discussion when the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee looked at the Council's digital strategy and approach.
3. The Committee was informed that there were 4 pilots being run with MySupportBroker, an organisation that supported individuals in assessments and identification of care packages. The Committee was informed there were a number of potential benefits to commissioning MySupportBroker, including the potential to increase capacity and allow the Council to undertake the assessments and re-assessments necessary to achieve the efficiencies identified within the F,F&CS project.
4. The Committee asked whether the finances for the increased training and resources had been identified and ring-fenced to support implementation. It was commented by officers that the above was within the corporate budget, and that the need for it to be protected had been recognised by the budget holders in question. The Committee was informed that the Chief Executive had commented that F,F&CS was not solely a Directorate priority, and the Corporate Leadership Team had expressed a commitment to its delivery.
5. The Committee was informed that the Directorate was developing a new induction programme for staff and that this would be an opportunity to communicate critical messages regarding the F,F&CS agenda.
6. Members expressed concern that a projected 20% reduction in support package costs would not be achievable, and that there was some concern that it represented a reduction in support. It was clarified by officers that 20% figure was based on the savings that MySupportBroker had modelled from prior experience. The Committee was also informed that this saving was not an imposed quota on assessments, as the Adult Social Care budget was demand led. Instead the 20% was an indicative figure of the savings the Directorate believed could be made through robust reassessments, and through better identification of resources within the community.
7. The Committee discussed the implications of the F,F&CS agenda, and highlighted some areas of concern. These included an increased risk in respect to safeguarding, created by encouraging people to access

resources outside of the Directorate's responsibility and oversight. It was also commented that any assessment that used F,F&CS as a principle should allow for individual choice. Members commented that it was important that reassessments of support needs were taking into account the "worse day" scenario, and commented that there should be a clear and transparent appeals process.

**Recommendations:**

- a) That the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee considers issues concerning improving IT solutions for Adult Social Care front-line staff at its meeting on 4 June 2014.

Action by: Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee

- b) That the Committee continues to monitor the budget position of the Directorate on a quarterly basis.

Action by: Democratic Services/Adult Social Care Directorate

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Committee Next Steps:**

None.

**37/14 COMMISSIONING AND MANAGING THE MARKET IN ADULT SOCIAL CARE [Item 9]**

**Declarations of interest:** None.

**Witnesses:** Anne Butler, Assistant Director for Commissioning  
Christian George, Category Manager  
Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care  
Mark Packer, Chief Executive, Welmede  
Richard Williams, Chair, Surrey Care Association  
Bob Hughes, Chief Executive, Sight for Surrey

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

[Graham Ellwood left the meeting at 12.04pm]

1. The external witnesses were invited to give a summary of their experiences in providing commissioned services for Surrey. A number of matters were raised, including the impact of savings being required year on year. Concerns were expressed by one witness that the wages they were able to offer increased risks around staff. The Committee discussed the difficulties in the recruitment and retention of staff within commissioned services. The Committee was informed that part of the challenge was a competitive market, and that there was a

perception of care work as unskilled. The role of schools in promoting care work was highlighted by witnesses. It was commented that interest rates and auto-enrolment in pensions were also contributing to additional cost pressures.

2. The Committee queried how external witnesses viewed the establishment of the Local Authority Trading Company (LATC), Surrey Choices. It was commented that partnership opportunities were welcomed, and that the understanding was that Surrey Choices would predominately offering day care and respite services. Witnesses indicated that they wanted to see a transparent relationship between the Council and the LATC, and that there was no preferential treatment in the commissioning of services.
3. The Committee discussed the implications of the Care Bill, in particular the risk it posed to commissioned services. It was highlighted that private clients often paid more for the services they received, and that this enabled a reduced cost to those supported by the Council. The changes in legislation would enable people to request that the Council sourced their care services, and this had a potential to impact on commissioned services' finances.
4. The Committee raised the issue of developing a single assessment process for care needs, and the role commissioned services could play in developing this. It was highlighted that the Directorate was investigating the possibilities in this particular area.

**Recommendations:**

- a) That the private providers meet with the Directorate to explore the mutual challenges in recruiting and retaining high quality staff, and identify areas where they can jointly influence the market.
- b) That a list of commissioned services is circulated to local Committees with a focus on what services are available locally.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Committee Next Steps:**

None.

**38/14 SURREY CHOICES - UPDATE [Item 10]**

**Declarations of interest:** None.

**Witnesses:**

Dexter James, Surrey Choices  
Simon Laker, Surrey Choices  
Paul Oliver, Surrey Choices  
Jon Savage, Surrey Choices

Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care  
Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Committee was given a brief update on the progress since Surrey Choices had been established. It was commented that the company was looking at developing its services to respond to the wishes of those who accessed them.
2. The Committee asked whether the TUPE arrangements had increased staff liabilities. Witnesses commented that although there were a significant range of liabilities, it had been the Council's wish that the company maintain them. It was further commented that the quality of staff was felt to be one of the key areas that differentiated Surrey Choices from its competitors.
3. The Committee discussed the potential business plan for Surrey Choices, it was highlighted that there was a cultural change required within the organisation in order to improve commercial understanding amongst managers. It was commented that there was a number of engagement events to ensure that both staff and those who used the service were given the opportunity to input in how Surrey Choices developed in the future.

**Recommendations:**

None.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Committee Next Steps:**

None.

**39/14 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME  
[Item 11]**

**Declarations of interest:** None.

**Witnesses:** None.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Committee noted its Recommendation Tracker and Forward Work Programme. It was commented that the Forward Work Programme would be reviewed in order to take the Cabinet Member priorities into consideration.

**Recommendations:**



None.

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

None.

**Committee Next Steps:**

None.

**40/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]**

The Committee noted its next meeting would be 26 June 2014 at 10am.

Meeting ended at: 1.15 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

FRIEND FAMILY AND COMMUNITY POTENTIAL SAVINGS - NEW PACKAGES & HIGHEST 40 RE-ASSESSMENTS

Client Group	FORECAST SAVINGS IN 2014-15					FORECAST SAVINGS IN 2015-16			
	New Packages (based on 2013/14)	Savings Achieved from New packages Reducing unit cost by 20% Half Year Effect	No of Re-Assessments	Savings from top 40 Re- Assessments	Total Forecast savings in 2014-15	FYE of 2014-15 News	FYE of 2014-15 Re-Assessments	2015-16 New Packages	Total Forecast savings in 2015-16
Older People	3344	-2,292,604	440	-544,646	-2,837,250	-4,585,207	-3,571,017	-2,292,604	-10,448,827
Physical Disabilities	665	-535,755	440	-2,120,650	-2,656,405	-1,071,509	-3,191,944	-535,755	-4,799,208
Learning Disabilities	372	-521,885	440	-3,153,072	-3,674,957	-1,043,771	-4,750,669	-521,885	-6,316,325
Mental Health	154	-138,605	40	-158,458	-297,064	-277,211	-249,580	-138,605	-665,396
Transition	377	-437,564	40	-422,965	-860,529	-875,127	-656,994	-437,564	-1,969,684
	4912	-3,926,412	1,400	-6,399,792	-10,326,204	-7,852,825	-12,420,203	-3,926,412	-24,199,441

ASSUMPTIONS: Page 11

**NEWS**

- Savings based on average cost of Community Services
- Assumed new services are the same level as 2013-14
- Assumed 22 weeks effect for all news
- Assumed 20% savings

**REASSESSMENTS**

- Savings based on highest 40 Community packages in 2014-15
- Assumed 20 re-assessments Q1 - Q2 for PSD and PLD in each of the 11 Localities
- Assumed 20 re-assessments Q1 & Q2 for MH across the service
- Assumed 20 re-assessments per quarter to Transition
- Assumed 20 Re-assessment Q3 & Q4 OP in each of the 11 Localities

Savings assumed Q1 = 39 weeks, Q2 = 26 weeks, Q3 = 13 weeks, Q4 = zero in the current year

### Adult Social Care 2014/15 ALT Priority Finance Measures

ASC Strategic Intent	ASC Priority 2014/15	Proposed Measure/s	Target	Reporting Period	ALT Priority Lead	Service Lead for Measure/s
Page 12	1. Improve the support planning process to ensure that people's family, friends and community support networks are fully factored into their care plans so they can live independently, prevent / postpone the need for funded care and support services, and track the associated levels of cost and <b>demand</b> which are key determinants in delivering to budget.	1a)* Balance spend per month on individually commissioned ('spot') care to the profiled budget	Average spend of £21.2m per month across the year from a current spend of £22m	Monthly	<b>Paul Carey-Kent</b>	Interim Assistant Directors PC&S
		1b) Effectively support plan for new 'spot' community care packages and commission them at an average weekly cost that is 20% lower in 2014/15 compared with 2013/14	Older People Home Care - £188 to £150			
			Older People Direct Payments - £211 to £168			
			PSD Supported Living / Home Care - £228 to £182			
			PSD Direct Payments - £197 to £158			
			PLD Supported Living / Home Care - £544 to £435			
			PLD Direct Payments - £201 to £161			
			MH Supported Living / Home Care - £416 to £333			
			MH Direct Payments - £135 to £108			
			Transition PLD Supported Living / Home Care - £463 to £370			
		Transition PLD Direct Payments - £250 to £200				
		1c) Limit the number of new non-residential cases commissioned 10% or more above the indicative personal budget (ie as reduced to take account of FFC)	No more than 20% of all new non-residential at the start of the year reducing to 10% by the end of the year			
		1d) Carry out targeted reassessments of existing 'spot' community care packages to ensure the most effective care arrangements are in place at the right cost and that FFC support is fully captured and factored into support plans	Older People 440 reassessments in Q3 & Q4 to achieve £0.6m savings			
			PSD 440 reassessments in Q1 & Q2 to achieve £2.1m savings			
			PLD 440 reassessments in Q1 & Q2 to achieve £3.1m savings			
			MH 40 reassessments in Q1 & Q2 to achieve £0.2m savings			
			Transition 40 in Q1 & Q2 reassessments to achieve £0.4m savings			
1e)** Monitor the increase in 'spot' service user numbers compared to the budgeted increase from February 2014 to March 2015	Older People - net increase of 160 services Feb 14 - Mar 15					
	PSD - net increase of 168 services Feb 14 - Mar 15					
	PLD - net increase of 310 services Feb 14 - Mar 15					
	MH - net increase of 43 services Feb 14 - Mar 15					

\* This measure exclude care services for Transition clients who have transferred from Children's, Schools & Families and are under the age of 25.

\*\* Excludes Other Community Care service user numbers as these services do not have a significant impact on the overall cost of individually commissioned care