

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 5 December 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, 16 January 2014.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Keith Witham (Chairman)
- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- A Mrs Liz Bowes
- A Mr Graham Ellwood
- A Miss Marisa Heath
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- * 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

Substitute Members:

- * Mr Denis Fuller

In attendance

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

64/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Marisa Heath, Liz Bowes and Graham Ellwood. Denis Fuller acted as a substitute for Graham Ellwood.

65/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 24 OCTOBER 2013 [Item 2]

These were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

66/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

67/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

68/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

The Committee did not make any referrals to Cabinet at its last meeting so there were no responses to report.

69/13 DIRECTOR'S UPDATE [Item 6]

Witnesses: Dave Sargeant, Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Cabinet Member informed the Committee that the Local Authority Trading Company business plan would be considered at the Cabinet meeting on 17 December 2013.
2. The Committee was told that discussions were currently taking place between the Surrey Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) and the Council in relation to the allocation and use of Integration Transformation Fund monies. It was clarified that this was not a new stream of funding, but money that would be shared between the Council and the CCGs. Its intention was to encourage closer working between the health service and social care to realise better benefits, but also protect existing levels of service. It was highlighted that there was some anxiety felt by the CCGs around how the Integration Transformation Fund would impact on their budgets in the future. It was highlighted that the role of the fund was to ensure better whole systems working, and that it required a significant level of negotiation. The Committee was informed that there was a challenging time-line in relation to the funding, as it required oversight by the Health & Wellbeing Board prior to Cabinet and CCG approval in January 2014.
3. Officers outlined that the benefits identified in recent Rapid Improvement Events (RIEs) were beginning to be realised. The model office developed in Woking was in the process of being rolled out to all locality teams, and it was having a positive impact in freeing up

practitioner time. The Committee was informed that they would be receiving a report outlining the changes to business processes, a result of the RIE undertaken to address issues in this area, at the next meeting.

[Richard Walsh and Saj Hussain arrived at 10.15am]

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/Further information to be provided:

None.

Committee next steps:

None.

70/13 RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION UPDATE [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Ken Akers, HR Relationships Manager (Adults)
Dave Sargeant, Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support
Cliff Bush, Chairman of the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

[Fiona White arrived at 10.30am]

1. The Committee queried whether front-line teams were being adequately staffed, and whether there were particular geographic areas where it was proving more difficult to recruit. Officers recognised there were significant pressures in terms of staffing levels for front-line teams. However, it was highlighted that there had been a proactive approach around promoting certain areas, and 'head-hunting' practitioners where there were specific levels of need.
2. The Committee asked whether there were difficulties in recruiting experienced practitioners. Officers commented that there was a nationally recognised concern about the readiness of social work graduates to make the transition to practice, and that a nationally enhanced support programme had been developed and was being taken forward in local partnership to support graduates during their first year of practice. Officers commented that the next step would be to ensure better networks were being developed into universities and schools to attract people into the sector and make sure the curriculum was informed by issues from the shop floor.
3. The Committee queried how the image of care sector work could be improved to ensure more people chose to undertake the training.

Officers commented that this work was being undertaken in partnership with Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) to raise the care sector as a growing employment market. The cost of living in Surrey and the network links to London were both highlighted as potential barriers to improving recruitment.

4. The Committee commented that there was a historic issue around levels of pay related to occupational therapists, and queried whether this had improved. Officers commented that the level of pay compared with the national level, but recognised that there was still a challenge in relation to how the profession was recognised.
5. The Committee asked what scope there was to develop a trainee programme where people earned a qualification while working. It was outlined that social work required a professional qualification that required registration with the Health Care Professionals' Council. It was commented that it was more difficult to move from an occupational role to a professional one in Adult Social Care than it had been historically. It was suggested that this was an area where Members could work on a national level to raise awareness of the challenge this presented.
6. The Committee was informed that there was a strong agency market in the south-east, and this had a negative impact on recruitment. It was commented that there was scope for Surrey to join up with regional partners to discuss how better to control and influence this market. The Committee asked whether there had been consideration as to whether the Council could set up its own staff agency. Officers commented that this was a possibility that could be explored in the future, and highlighted that Kent County Council had undertaken a similar piece of work to great success.
7. The Committee queried the impact of staff absence on case-loads, and whether the general level of case-loads per practitioner was seen to be high. It was commented that the recent Rapid Improvement Event (RIE) to address business processes would improve this area, as it would enable practitioners to hold a higher case-load more efficiently. It was also highlighted that Adult Social Care used a national model of intelligence to identify what was an appropriate level of staffing. It was commented that any decision to use agency workers was taken using a risk-based approach. The Committee was informed that issues related to number of mental health practitioners had required an increase in the use of locum practitioners.

Recommendations:

- a) That the Committee notes the 17 per cent vacancy rate across the Adult Social Care Directorate, and encourages officers to continue measures to address this.
- b) That officers develop closer working with universities and colleges to ensure the supply of quality applicants for vacancies within the Directorate.

- c) That the Cabinet Member lobby nationally for the development of vocational routes into the social work profession.
- d) That officers explore a regional and localised approach to sourcing agency staff.
- e) That members are involved in the development of the next workforce strategy, prior to its publication in April 2014.

Action by: HR Relationships Manager (Adults) / Scrutiny Officer

71/13 SERVICE FOR PEOPLE WITH A LEARNING DISABILITY PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW (PVR) UPDATE [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Jo Poynter, Senior Manager Commissioning – Learning Disabilities

Dave Sargeant, Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

Cliff Bush, Chairman of the Surrey Coalition of Disabled People

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee discussed the implications on cost in terms of other Council's residents based in Surrey. It was commented that there was always a legal requirement to ensure an individual's needs were met in all instances, but this had a potential to prevent an asset being used for a Surrey resident. It was highlighted that Surrey's proximity to London had an impact in this respect.
2. The Committee explored a number of questions with respect to residential care and independent care for individuals. Officers highlighted that Adult Social Care offered a diverse range of care packages suited to individual need. It was highlighted that supported living could often be an appropriate means of addressing individual need. Members raised concerns that re-registration could impact on the costs to borough and district councils. It was explained that those with a learning disability would be entitled to the same housing support as any other resident, and that it was important to recognise that the County Council should not be paying a supplementary cost when this was not required.
3. The Committee queried what impact the Care Bill and welfare reform were likely to have on people with a learning disability. Officers commented that there was substantial work being undertaken to realise the impacts of the Care Bill. However, officers expressed the view that the changes to welfare reform would most likely have an impact on those assessed with a mild level of need. This could have a cumulative effect over time and mean that people needed more substantial support in the longer term.

[David Munro left at 11.30am]

4. The Committee asked what efforts were being made, in light of the Directorate's needs to make efficiencies, to ensure the quality of care provided to people with a learning disability remained consistent. Officers commented that there were robust safeguarding and care quality measures in place in regard to the commissioning process.
5. The Committee was informed that the options around the Local Authority Trading Company were part of the work being undertaken in 2014, pending Cabinet approval of the business case. It was commented that an additional offer in relation to provision of residential care was a potential consideration.
6. The Committee requested further details in relation to short-breaks, specifically in relation to how they were provided and what alternatives were available.
7. Witnesses informed the Committee that there was work being undertaken by the Adult Social Care advisory group to explore increases in numbers of reported hate crimes against those with a learning disability. It was also highlighted that there were efforts being made to improve the transport offer as it was felt that this could be disempowering on occasions. However, the Directorate were praised for the move towards greater personalisation for those with a learning disability.

Recommendations:

- a) That officers work to increase the occupancy rate of Surrey assets with Surrey Residents.

Action by: Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

- b) That future reports illustrate the work of community/ self-help groups in relation to each work-stream in the Public Value Review.

Action by: Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

- c) That future reports demonstrate how the service has offered suitable alternatives to short breaks, and seeks more opportunities to identify alternatives.

Action by: Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

- d) That officers report back to the Committee on the progress of the Service for People With A Learning Disability Public Value Review in a year.

Action by: Assistant Director for Personal Care and Support

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee next steps:

The Committee will receive a further progress update in late 2014.

72/13 PROGRESS WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ADULT MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW (PVR) [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Donal Hegarty, Senior Manager, Commissioning, Adult Social Care

Megan Aspal, Coordinator - Let's Link

David Thomas, Mental Health Ambassador

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was presented with a testimonial with regards to the role of a mental health ambassador, as well as a brief outline of some of the challenges encountered by someone with enduring mental health difficulties. It was highlighted that the ambassador role had empowered individuals and improved their confidence. Officers commented that there was a need to improve the public perception of mental health, and that the Committee should note that there were distinctions between a period of mental distress, and those with enduring mental health difficulties.
2. The Committee was informed that the Directorate had moved from a grant-based provision of services to a more consistent county-wide commissioning of mental health provision. It was highlighted that this was not a prescriptive offer, but one that utilised local and community resources to meet need. It was commented by officers that there remained a challenge to ensure that providers were ensuring suitable outreach and extending their support where required. The Committee was informed that this was being addressed through rigorous monitoring, and that officers were confident that the organisations were able to meet this challenge.
3. The Committee raised the role of Local Committees and Parish Councils in being able to support local resources, and urged officers to share information about local provisions with them.
4. The Committee asked whether certain areas of the county were being sign-posted as having better mental health provision. It was recognised by officers that there was a historic perception and infrastructure that influenced such matters, but that the Public Value Review (PVR) was intended to ensure a greater equity of provision across the county.
5. The Committee asked what options were considered in relation to housing for those with enduring mental health difficulties. It was highlighted that only 32 people in the county had been assessed as

requiring residential care, and that supported living would be the first preference for the majority of service users.

6. Witnesses informed the Committee that the Mental Health Services PVR had improved positive outcomes for those experiencing mental health difficulties, but also highlighted the importance of advocacy in this area, particularly in relation to Gypsy Romany and Traveller communities.

Recommendations:

- a) That the Cabinet Member for Business Services consider the need for internal training for Surrey County Council employees, in order to prevent discrimination against staff and residents with mental health difficulties.

Action by: Cabinet Member for Business Services

- b) That the Directorate circulates a report to Local Committees advising them of the work of the Adult Mental Health Services Public Value Review and outlining the provisions in the area.

Action by: Senior Manager, Commissioning, Adult Social Care

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps: None.

**73/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME
[Item 10]**

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points of the discussion:

1. The Chairman informed the Committee that he had requested reports on both the Local Authority Trading Company and the Adult Social Care Business Process review to be brought to the meeting on 16 January 2014. The Dementia Friendly Communities item would be deferred to the meeting on 6 March 2014.
2. The Committee also requested a short report outlining the cost implications and process in relation to appointing co-opted members onto the Committee.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided: The Committee will update its Forward Work Programme to reflect the changes discussed.

Committee next steps: None.

74/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The Committee noted that its next meeting would be held at 10am on 16 January 2014.

Meeting ended at: 12.55 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank