

MINUTES of the meeting of the **SOCIAL CARE SERVICES BOARD** held at 10.00 am on 23 June 2016 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Friday, 2 September 2016.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Keith Witham (Chairman)
- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Ramon Gray
- Mr Ken Gulati, Substituted by Mr Bob Gardner
- Miss Marisa Heath
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- Mrs Yvonna Lay, Substituted by Mr Bill Chapman
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Mr Adrian Page
- * Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
- * Mrs Pauline Searle
- * Ms Barbara Thomson
- Mr Chris Townsend
- * Mrs Fiona White
- Mrs Helena Windsor

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Chairman of the County Council
Mr Nick Skellett CBE, Vice-Chairman of the County Council

Co-opted Members:

In attendance

Mr Tim Evans, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence
Mr Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

41/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Ken Gulati, Yvonna Lay, Chris Townsend and Helena Windsor. Bill Chapman acted as a substitute for Yvonna Lay and Bob Gardner acted as a substitute for Ken Gulati.

42/16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 12 MAY 2016 [Item 2]

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

43/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest to report.

44/16 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions submitted to the Board.

45/16 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]

The Board received a response from the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing regarding the Surrey Family Support Programme.

This response is attached in the annex below.

46/16 UPDATE FROM THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE [Item 6]

Witnesses:

Helen Atkinson, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health
Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

Key points of discussion:

1. The Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health gave an update concerning:
 - Deprivation of Liberties (DoLs)
 - social care in prisons; and,
 - the review of the Accommodation with Care and Support Strategy.

2. The Board was informed that DoLs requests to Surrey County Council had significantly increased over the last two years, citing that 3987 DoLs requests had been made in the financial year 2015/2016. It was explained that steps were being taken to meet the challenge of increased demand. This included increasing Best Interest Assessors and improved training to existing staff to cope with this demand.

Dorothy Ross-Tomin entered the meeting at 10.35am

3. The Board was informed that the issues related to DoLs were a national challenge for those providing Adult Social Care. It was highlighted that the Council was dealing well with the issue when compared nationally, though it still presented a considerable risk to the Council. It was clarified that cases that were considered the most at risk were always prioritised for a DoLs assessment. The Board requested a paper for the next Adult Social Care themed meeting of the Board.

4. The Board was provided with an update on the work undertaken by the service with regard to social care provisions within the prison system in Surrey. It was highlighted that those requiring services in this sector has been higher than was forecast, with the three primary areas being physical disability, mental health support and dementia. It was agreed that a further report would come to the next Adult Social Care themed meeting of the Board. Members also expressed support for a sub-group to be established to monitor progress in this area twice a year. The following Members volunteered: Barbara Thomson, Fiona White and Margaret Hicks.

5. Officers gave an update to the Board on the progress of the Accommodation with Care and Support programme, and the development of integrated commissioning with NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). The Board was informed that a core aim of the programme was to increase accommodation in order to meet the growth in demand for those needing care and support, improve independence, and reduce those housed long-term in care homes.

6. The Board was informed that approximately 600 new flats were required to meet projected demand, and that the council was working in partnership with CCGs, district and borough councils, and with the market in order to meet the challenge raised by this growth in demand.

7. The Board queried whether the service was making best use of Council-owned property, and asked a specific query about the future use for the six closed care homes. It was confirmed that the Accommodation with Care and Support review would include a consideration of the appropriateness of these sites in question, and that the decision by Cabinet that these sites would be retained for social care use was still the case.

8. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence highlighted that there were concerns about provision for young people with learning difficulties transitioning into Adult Social Care, and the growing need for respite care. The Board raised the possibility of mapping out the next five years in relation to the provision of accommodation with care and support, and the council could seek to engage the community in supporting its strategy.

**47/16 HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE INTEGRATION: BETTER CARE FUND
2016/2017 [Item 7]**

Witnesses:

Helen Atkinson, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence
Dominic Wright, Chief Executive of Guildford and Waverly CCG

Key points of discussion:

1. The Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health explained to the Board that the Better Care Fund (BCF) was part of a wider integration between CCGs and the Council. It was also highlighted that these plans were expected to work in collaboration with the NHS five year forward view, and the locally developed NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs). The Board was informed that the integration agenda was seeking to improve preventative services, in order to reduce demand on the NHS.
2. The Board was informed that the pooled BCF budgets enabled the two organisations to achieve closer integration and realise efficiencies through this.
3. The Board queried what challenges existed in delivering the BCF plans. Witnesses commented that there was a significant difference in cultures between the two organisations, though it was highlighted that the past few years had seen closer working together. The developing digital roadmap and information sharing that was underway was highlighted as a good example of this.
4. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence explained that there were a number of common problems faced by both organisations with regard to workforce development. It was highlighted that the two organisations would work collaboratively to address this.
5. The Board queried how the metrics for measuring the delivery of the BCF had been established. Officers explained that these metrics were generally set nationally by the NHS, however that some were able to be set at a local level. The Board was informed that a locally chosen measurement for Surrey was the prevalence of dementia cases.
6. A question was put forward by the Board regarding the voluntary sector of care, and whether it can realistically provide care with reduced funding, and queried how the service is forward planning to meet this contingency. The Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health reassured the Board that the service was working with partners to ensure that these issues were resolved. It was explained that any decisions made financially must be made in partnership and that the service was building relationships with local business and charities to reduce risk.

7. The Board commented on the complex structure of CCGs and questioned why there were presently three STPs covering the region rather than one. It was explained that there was not a cohesive boundary in Surrey evolving for the STPs, and that these had been decided centrally by NHS England. It was, however, clarified that these boundaries were permeable to encourage interconnectivity and that the CCGs were working closely with the Council to ensure that they are closely linked.

Recommendations

1. That the Board monitor the financial position of the Better Care Fund as part of regular service budget updates to the Performance and Finance sub-group.
2. That a further joint session on the Sustainability and Transformation Plans is scheduled for late 2016/17.
3. That the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board chairman seek to secure Member representation at a suitable level within the three STP governance structures.
4. That the Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board cover the changes that NHS England will be making (for example in joint commissioning of Primary Care and in development of the clinical workforce).
5. That a joint Social Care Services Board and Wellbeing and Health Scrutiny Board four person monitoring group is established to oversee how the BCF and STP plans and delivery progress, with a particular focus on.
 - a. Information sharing across the organisation
 - b. Social care and NHS staffingTo report back to the joint session in late 2016/17

48/16 CONSULTATION ON A REVISED CHARGING POLICY FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE SERVICES [Item 8]

Witnesses:

Helen Atkinson, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care and Public Health
Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

Tim Evans, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

Nick Markwick, Surrey Coalition of Disabled People

Maria Hewson, Action for Carers

Key points of discussion:

1. The Board was given a preliminary summary of the responses to the consultation and heard from representatives from the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People and Action for Carers.

2. It noted that there was strong resistance to the proposed changes and concerns about the detrimental impact on disabled people, their carers and families given the reduction in disposable income. The Board expressed the view that there was not sufficient evidence of how the proposed changes would affect individuals in the Equalities Impact Assessment.
3. The Board queried whether the negative feedback from those consulted would have an effect on the proposals. The Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence informed the Board that the Council would move in line with other local authorities in its charging policy. It was highlighted by the Board and external witnesses that the cost of living in Surrey was comparable to London, and not the local authorities cited in the consultation document.
4. The Board commented that it was not apparent whether the additional revenue generated as a result of the proposed changes would also mean additional implementation and administrative costs to the Council. It was commented by witnesses that the cost of assessing a large group of individuals and implementing the proposals could prove prohibitive in the immediate term. It was also highlighted by witnesses that there were case law rulings regarding the raising of charges against night-time attendance allowances, and that they believed this should have been reflected in the proposals.
5. The Board questioned whether the low response rate was a result of those being consulted being unclear on the proposals and their impact. The Board queried whether the negative response to it would have an impact on the proposals.
6. The representative for Action for Carers expressed concern that these proposals may deter residents from seeking support from the service, and highlighted that these proposals could also impact on carers and families.
7. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence offered to provide a full breakdown of the concerns put forward by the representative for Action for Carers and the representative for the Surrey Coalition for Disabled People, and circulate that response to the witnesses and to the Board.

Recommendations:

1. That the Board understood the need for potential cost saving measures, but did not endorse the proposals as they currently stood, with the exception of the administration set-up fee.
2. That Cabinet provide greater evidence for the cost-benefit of implementing the proposed changes to Adult Social Care charging policy
3. That the Cabinet demonstrate they have taken the impact of carers and families into account and have sought to mitigate this impact through a more robust Equalities Impact Assessment
4. That the Cabinet provide evidence as to how the administration fee is calculated and when it will be subject to review
5. That, taking individual concerns into consideration, the Cabinet establish there are no indirect impacts on an individual's package arising from:
 - the implementation of the national living wage;
 - the review into the grants programme

49/16 NHS CONTINUING HEALTHCARE [Item 9]

Witnesses:

Paul Morgan, Head of Continuing Care, Adult Social Care
Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence

Key points of discussion:

1. The Head of Continuing Care, Adult Social Care explained the role that the team has in conjunction with Surrey Downs CCG, the area lead on Continuing Health Care (CHC). It was highlighted that this was a partnership approach with a joint action plan that was aimed at finding efficiencies that can be made as a result of this partnership.
2. It was noted by the officer that social care and health being delivered by different organisations could lead to unnecessary tension. It was suggested that the organisations needed to work together to ensure they could meet the needs of the most vulnerable.
3. The Board queried how much the Continuing Healthcare team cost the service and how much was being saved. Officers responded that, for the financial year 2015/16, the team cost the Council circa £400,000, while the Council had avoided potential liabilities of circa £3.5 million.

4. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Wellbeing and Independence noted that disputes over continuing healthcare were often a barrier to early discharge from hospital, and that the team's work was highly valued in seeking resolutions in this regard.

The Board was informed that the law surrounding the subject was complex, particularly because of the financial implications arising from the failure of statutory provision. It was also highlighted that decisions were reliant on clinical assessments and this was a significant factor in the outcome of any decision.

5. It was noted that a robust dispute resolution team was required in order to avert cases from going to the courts, which was a costly and time consuming process for the service.
6. It was suggested by the Board that it may be helpful to give hold a Member's Briefing session based on the work of the CHC team to raise awareness among members on the work they undertake.

The Board thanks the Continuing Healthcare team for the valued work it undertakes.

Recommendations:

- That officers develop a Members' briefing to outline the valued work of the Continuing Healthcare team, and the key challenges it faces.

50/16 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 10]

The Board approved the current recommendations tracker and forward work programme.

The Performance and Finance Sub-Group of the Board provided an update to the Board. This update is attached in the annex below.

51/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The next meeting will be held at 02 September 2016, 10.00am, at County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 1.09 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Email received 14 June 2016

Dear Keith -

Surrey Family Support Programme

Thank you for your letter of 6 June, addressed to Linda Kemeny, following up on the Social Care Services Board scrutiny of the Surrey Family Support Programme at its meeting in January.

Regarding the national evaluation of the Troubled Families Programme. The government's evaluation of the first phase of the programme, i.e. progress up until May 2015, is due to be published later in the Summer or in the early Autumn, depending on when the report has been through its Whitehall clearances. We expect that the DCLG's findings and evaluations of the second phase of the programme, i.e. from May 2015, will be published on a regular basis through to 2020. The timescales for the accumulation and collection of the families and finance data in the second phase will likely mean that useful feedback may not be published until next year by which time a significant number of families have been through the programme. If the Social Care Services Board wishes to review the estimated savings made through the Surrey programme in light of the Government's evaluation of the first phase, then late Autumn or Winter will be the best time to schedule this.

We will have to wait for the publication of the evaluation report before being certain of the government's position over the funding of the first phase of the Troubled Families Programme. However, the expectation is that it is very likely that the DCLG will be looking to demonstrate that the savings created by this model of working are greater than its costs and therefore the business case to locally sustain programmes is made.

The government's intentions for the second phase of the Programme are that the Programme will be a catalyst to transform local working arrangements to significantly increase systematic, multi-agency and integrated working around the most complex families. We should assume therefore that the government is convinced of its business case.

The DCLG's Director of the Troubled Families Unit, Joe Tuke, is due to pay a visit to Surrey in the near future. Arrangements are being made now. This will provide an

opportunity to discuss current and future funding directly with the DCLG. I will consider, with my Cabinet colleagues, any further action on lobbying the government over funds after this meeting.

One of the keys to the long-term sustainability of the Family Support Programme will be how the Council integrates the whole family working and multi-agency approach developed in this programme within the wider Early Help Strategy. The Social Care Services Board will have opportunities to consider this as part of the scrutiny of the Council's Confident in Our Future programme to improve services to children.

I have passed on your thanks to those officers who have secured the positive progress to children and families through the Family Support Programme.

Kind regards

Clare Curran
Cabinet Member for Children and Families Wellbeing
Councillor - Bookham and Fetcham W
Surrey County Council

Social Care Services Board
Performance and Finance sub-group
20 June 2016

Verbal update for the Board

The sub-group reviewed the following five Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) with the Interim Head of Children's Services:

- Child Protection (CP) Plans over 18 months
- Young People aged 16 or over subject to CP plans
- Child and Family Assessments (CFAs) open for longer than 45 days
- Personal Education Plans (PEPs) overdue
- Pathway Plans overdue

It was noted that three more KPIs remain in development, and will be reported to the next meeting of the Performance and Finance sub-group.

The sub-group discussed:

- How the Interim head of Children's Services was embedding improved management practice by:
 - using large staff meetings to share key messages and updates;
 - circulating management instruction notes to clarify processes and responsibilities; and
 - improving performance monitoring, quality assurance and auditing to address key priorities.
- How the service was targeting its efforts to reduce the number of children on CP plans for over 18 months. The Interim Head of Children's Services gave an indication that the sub-group would expect to see this number decrease in the coming months.
- The high number of young people aged 16 and over on CP plans being related in part to the increased awareness of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).
- The role of Early Help and the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) in alleviating case-load pressure of the safeguarding system. The Board will be receiving a more detailed update on this work at its meeting on 2 September 2016.
- The role of different agencies in relation to safeguarding. In particular the Sub-Group highlighted concerns by schools regarding their role in preventative and safeguarding work.
- A more detailed set of notes will be circulated to the Board for information in the coming few days.

This page is intentionally left blank