

MINUTES of the meeting of the **ADULT SOCIAL CARE SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 26 June 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 Friday, 5 September 2014.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Keith Witham (Chairman)
- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Graham Ellwood
- Miss Marisa Heath
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- Mr George Johnson
- * Mr Colin Kemp
- Rachael I. Lake
- * 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

Substitutes:

- * Dr Zully Grant-Duff
- * Mr Bob Gardner

41/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Rachael I Lake, Graham Ellwood and Marisa Heath. Dr Zully Grant-Duff and Bob Gardner acted as substitutes. Apologies were also received from George Johnson.

42/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 1 MAY 2014 [Item 2]

These were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

43/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

44/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions

45/13 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

46/13 DIRECTOR'S UPDATE [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

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

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

1. The Interim Strategic Director provided a verbal update on the Better Care Fund and advised that meetings were taking place between the Council and CCGs. The Guildford & Waverley CCG had been looking at integrated care options; workshops had been planned and officers had met recently with the Health Secretary Jeremy Hunt. It was noted that the approach taken by each CCG varied according to local need. There were concerns about NHS financing of the Better Care Fund and feedback requested from NHS England had been delayed.

2. The Committee was informed there has been a £200,000 investment from the Public Service Transformation Network to help project manage health and social care integration. The Committee asked how officers were ensuring that service users were not left behind. Officers commented that they were involving clinicians and frontline staff and encouraging their feedback. For example, in discussions with the acute sector, mental health trusts were now also involved.

3. The Committee asked if there was a pilot in place for an integrated model taking into account regional variance, noting that needs vary across the different boroughs. Officers commented that each CCG would be doing things

differently, to take into account these variations. Officers added that they were looking at the whole picture, and prioritising local needs, as one size does not fit all circumstances.

Recommendations:

The Strategic Director to report back with comments on the following priorities which were recorded as red at the end of the year:

- Grow preventative services in partnership with Borough and District Councils
- Maximise social capital in localities with effective care packages
- Empower people and their carers to live independently

Actions/further information to be provided:

- None

Committee Next Steps:

None

It was decided by the Committee to take items 15 – 17 before item 7.

47/13 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 15]

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

48/13 CONFIDENTIAL UPDATE FROM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR [Item 16]

The Interim Strategic Director gave a verbal update on confidential matters relating to a Serious Case Review.

49/13 PUBLICITY FOR PART TWO ITEMS [Item 17]

The Interim Strategic Director gave a verbal update on confidential matters relating to a Serious Case Review.

50/13 BUDGET UPDATE [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care
Paul Carey-Kent, Strategic Finance Manager
John Woods, Assistant Director for Policy and Strategy.

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

1. The Committee was informed that a balanced budget had been projected, with £4.1 million of savings already achieved and £12.7 million of savings on track without any further management action. £25 million of savings still needed to be implemented including £10 million through Family, Friends and Community Support (FFC) programme.

2. The Committee was informed that savings for the FFC programme had been remodelled on the basis of spending 20% less on new community care services compared to the amount spent in 2013/14 and carrying out targeted reassessments of existing community care packages. In 2014/15 it is forecast to involve commissioning effective support for 4,912 new community care services and carrying out 1,400 reassessments. The Committee was informed that research by the University of Birmingham has shown that there are positive outcomes for service users in the FFC programme, alongside savings.

3. The Committee asked for officers to bring qualitative evidence showing the outcomes of packages and what they mean for service users. Officers agreed to do this and informed the Committee that in the past money was sometimes duplicated for services and this should be looked at to make sure that public money is spent appropriately.

4. The Committee asked about the current status and the future for the FFC and if good practice was being shared. The Committee also noted that the community should be able to see the impact; that this is not just saving money but also helping individuals. Officers said they were reviewing progress and that they would bring evidence to committee.

5. Officers explained that the savings targets were not definitive figures. Projected savings achieved from new packages reducing cost by 20% totalled around £4 million. The Committee questioned the 'savings from top 40 reassessments' figure from page 5 of the handout and officers clarified that the figure was from a total of 1,400 and should read top 40 per locality per month.

6. The Committee questioned whether after reassessment, some service users may need a higher rate of support and how that would fit with the 20% reduction target. Officers said that the 20% reduction was an average and that not all service users would fit into this category. Some service users would require nothing after reassessment and some would require more support than before. Officers further noted that if a service user's needs could not be met, then a discussion with the local team manager would take place. Officers confirmed that the targets were in place to help staff to better deliver social care but this would not prevent service users from getting the support that they needed.

7. Officers advised that the calculation of the amount of money that a service user would get was not a fixed model and also did not need to be met by a paid-for service. The 20% reduction target was based on a process staff have undergone to see how cases could have been handled differently. Officers

commented that this was a challenging agenda and there were many that may need reassessing, at an annual cost of £7 million for assessments.

8. The Committee asked about the issue of procurement of services and questioned whether there was a guarantee of buying care at a specific price. Officers said that nursing care is the biggest resource cost for Surrey, that residential care is bought at a lower rate, and that non-residential care service prices are as a result of a tender where the supplier proposes the price.

Recommendations:

The Committee:

- Noted the 2013-14 outturn
- Noted the April/May report
- Requests a report on the first four months of the financial year at the September meeting, with a summary sent by email on Quarter 1 in the interim (Action by: Paul Carey-Kent)
- Be provided with a further update on FFC at a future meeting or workshop, to include
 - An overview of the FFC offer covering best practice, current situation, next steps, and qualitative examples of care package provision, with practitioners from rural and urban areas invited as witnesses (Action by: Dave Sargeant/Paul Carey-Kent)

Actions/further information to be provided:

None

Committee next steps:

None.

51/13 SELF-FUNDER STRATEGY [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

John Woods, Assistant Director for Policy and Strategy.

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

1. The Committee was given a brief summary of the Dilnot recommendations around self-funders. The Government had capped self-funder care costs regardless of personal wealth. Self-funders now have the right to be assessed by the Council. They are then given an independent personal budget of what the Council would spend on their care. The Committee was informed that the Government has stated there would be 'no unfunded burdens' as a result of the Care Act 2014; however, Surrey County Council was concerned that the

system was unclear. The Committee was informed that regulations and guidance were not yet available from government.

2. The Committee raised concerns about the IT systems being up and running by April 2016 and also that the administration fee that the Care Act has enabled might be hard to implement and could cause confusion. Officers reported that they had concerns about the IT delivery but were in discussions about requirements. Until guidance was in place the IT system could not be created, possibly taking it past the April 2016 deadline. Officers commented that the administration fee would not be charged very often, and only in cases where the Council was asked to act as a broker for a self-funder. As the Council could only offer the market price, not the lower price a Council could get a service for, officers thought it unlikely that requests to act as a broker will happen often.

3. The Committee thanked John Woods for his work on this area and asked for an update on the pilot in Elmbridge. The Committee also requested a one page document for County Councillors on the issue to assist them in helping residents understand the changes.

4. The Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care commented that from discussions with colleagues in other councils, that Surrey County Council was well-advanced compared to the majority. The Assistant Director for Policy & Strategy was working directly with the Department of Health and it was noted that the financial modelling Surrey officers had developed was referred to as 'the Surrey model', highlighting its success.

5. The Committee asked about the provision of access to information and advice for residents. Officers said that part of the Care Act focused on the importance of information in helping people to make their own choices. Officers commented that websites and leaflets would not be sufficient and that information would need to be translated into formats that make it understandable in a variety of different ways, for different audiences.

6. The Committee queried if a self-funder started off buying their own care at a higher level than Surrey County Council would normally fund, and then met the cap, whether the Council would have an obligation to maintain this level of care and cost. Officers said that these 'threshold cases' would all be different and that the Council could either ask them to move to a place that is within the range the Council would pay, or could negotiate with the provider to reduce the rates.

Recommendations:

In relation to the Assessment and Review Strategy, the Committee:

- Endorsed the Elmbridge pilot evaluation criteria
- Requested that the outcome of the pilot and draft strategy be presented to Adult Social Care Select Committee in December, and;
- Request that officers produce an executive summary/briefing for all County Councillors, to aid understanding of the Care Act's requirements in relation to people who fund their own care.
(Action by: John Woods)

In relation to the Information and Advice Strategy, the Committee:

- Endorsed the strategic direction for ensuring residents in Surrey have universal access to information and advice.

The Committee adjourned at 11.50am and reconvened at 11.57am.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None

Committee next steps:

None.

52/13 GET WISE UPDATE [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Anne Butler, Assistant Director for Commissioning.
Norah Lewis, Assistant Senior Manager – Commissioning

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

External witnesses:

Clive Wood, Chief Executive – Surrey Disabled People's Partnership,
Vicki Atherton, Deputy Chief Executive - Surrey Disabled People's
Partnership,
Femi Sorinwa, Welfare Benefits Advisor – Surrey Disabled People's
Partnership.

1. Officers provided a brief overview of getWIS£ and outlined that it was a service available to all residents of Surrey with a focus on those most affected by the Coalition Government's welfare reforms which came in to force in 2012. Service users had one point of contact and could be met at a venue of their choice. They were supported in making applications which was of particular benefit to those without IT skills or access to a computer, as many benefits forms are online.

2. External witnesses stated that since getWIS£ became operational in April 2013 it had supported nearly 2,300 people and secured over £1.6 million in benefits. It also supported people through tribunals and appeals. Over its first year, getWIS£ had taken a holistic approach to providing not only support for benefits, but also advice on health, social care and referrals to voluntary organisations. The Surrey Hubs were a great source of referrals and easy to access given their town-centre locations. The witnesses noted that with the increasing discussion of welfare in the media and the forthcoming move to Universal Credit, people were looking for more support and knowledge and were coming to getWIS£. This had created a need for more staff and volunteers. External witnesses also discussed the effect of the move from

Disability Living Allowance to Personal Independence Payments, and the anxiety that some service users felt about the new medical assessments, which getWIS£ could support people through.

3. Officers acknowledged the good work that getWIS£ and its partners had done and noted the service supported the delivery of quality care to vulnerable people in Surrey, forming part of the FFC support, advice and provision of information.

4. The Committee acknowledged the successful first year of getWIS£. The Committee asked about the waiting time for benefit applications and appeals. External witnesses confirmed that applications for Personal Independence Payments could take up to a year, but that GetWIS£ supported claimants over that time and highlight other benefits that can be claimed in the meantime through its holistic service, for example referral to food banks. Members expressed significant concern about the delays described by the external witnesses and were particularly worried that those waiting for applications to be processed might not be receiving benefits they needed.

5. External witnesses discussed their flexible working arrangements with service users able to telephone getWIS£, meet at a hub or Council building, or request a home visit. The Committee asked if there was logic in other community organisations sharing locations with getWIS£, and officers agreed there would be benefits to doing this.

6. The Committee asked whether getWIS£ was more of an information service or a technical support for completing benefits forms. External witnesses and officers reported that it was both and that particularly with the onset of Universal Credit, more specialist support was required. Once forms have been filled in and while a service user is waiting on the hearing date of a tribunal for example, support was still needed in other ways.

7. External witnesses discussed the benefits checks that getWIS£ offer, which ensured that people claim everything they are entitled to. This would lead to more work but was essential to make sure that people received what they needed. getWIS£ could also make referrals to food banks and the Council's Local Assistant scheme, for example.

8. The Committee asked whether getWIS£ could ask the JobCentre for information on all unemployed people to proactively contact them about benefits. External witnesses said that this would be in breach of data protection; however, they have built a strong relationship with the JobCentres across Surrey and receive referrals from them.

Recommendations:

The Committee:

- Noted the report, including the progress made by getWIS£ in their first year of operation and the programme of activities planned by Surrey Disabled People's Partnership to enhance this universal offer
- Congratulated the Surrey Disabled People's Partnership and their partner organisations

- Commended the service for the results it has achieved – realising £1,660,698 of annualised benefits for 2,287 people in the last year.
- Recommends that the Cabinet Member takes forward with the relevant government minister the significant concerns raised regarding delays in welfare reform delivery. (Action by: Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care)
- Requests that the service work with its Commissioners to ensure waiting lists were not created with rising demands (Action by: John Woods)
- Recommends that the Service circulate (via Democratic Services) the contact details for getWIS£ to all County Councillors

Actions/further information to be provided:

- None
- **Committee next steps:**
- None.

53/13 SAFEGUARDING PEER REVIEW OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS UPDATE [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Christine Maclean, Safeguarding Adults Senior Manager.

Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Steve Cosser, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care

1. The Committee were informed that the peer-led review was carried out by Buckinghamshire social services. There were positive reviews overall and some key messages highlighted. The commitment of staff was commended as was the political leadership and commitment to continually improve the service.
2. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care stated that Buckinghamshire would be implementing some of the best practice they observed from Surrey.
3. The Committee congratulated Christine Maclean for her work on this and other issues over the years, noted that she would be leaving the Council very soon, and wished her a happy retirement.

Recommendations:

The Committee:

- Commended the service for their response to the Committee's recommendations and findings of the Peer Review
- Would continue to scrutinise the safeguarding arrangements in 2014/15 work plan with particular focus on new Care Act duties.

[Richard Walsh left the meeting at 12.45pm]

[Fiona White left the meeting at 12.50pm]

Actions/further information to be provided:

- None
- **Committee next steps:**
- None.

54/13 DOMICILIARY CARE TENDER [Item 11]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Jean Boddy, Senior Manager – Commissioning

Joanne Parkinson, Manager – Commissioning

Anna Tobiasz, Senior Category Specialist

Dave Sargeant, Interim Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Mel Few, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Steve Cosser, Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care

1. Officers presented an update on the domiciliary care tender. In particular the issue of 15 minute calls was discussed and officers reported that only 6% of the total calls made were of 15 minutes, and those were that length for the right reasons. Guidance had been reissued to staff on what would constitute a 15 minute call. Electronic monitoring was one way of ensuring that providers could demonstrate in real-time whether someone had responded to a call, and that has been made part of the tender process.

2. Officers also discussed staff wages. It is hard to attract staff into caring posts as a career and so providers were being asked to offer the living wage. It was noted that the tender was based on quality of care and not price.

3. Members of the Committee were informed about the Domiciliary Care Reference Group and were issued an invitation to join the group.

4. The Committee asked about what was being done to tackle the issue of loneliness of those in receipt of domiciliary care and stressed that continuity of care was very important. Officers responded that at every part of the process, service users were kept informed.

5. The Committee raised the point that workers from European Union countries had no requirement to be able to speak English and the problems that might cause. Officers said that there was a requirement in the tender agreement for service providers to be understood. Quality Assurance Managers also made visits to service users and take seriously any complaints.

Recommendations:

The Committee:

- Noted the report
- Endorsed the approach taken by the service
- Requested a briefing on the outcome of the tender in due course
- Put forward Margaret Hicks and Barbara Thomson as Member representative/s to sit on the Domiciliary Care Reference Group. (Action by: Jean Boddy)

Actions/further information to be provided:

- None
- **Committee next steps:**
- None.

55/13 YOUNG CARERS RESEARCH GROUP [Item 12]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: Dr Zully Grant-Duff, Colin Kemp, Margaret Hicks, Richard Walsh.

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

1. The Chairman of the Research Group, Dr Zully Grant-Duff, introduced the research group's report. The Committee was informed that due to time constraints, the group had not been able to speak to head teachers or representatives of the Phase councils. The group noted the constructive work that Surrey County Council had done to support young carers, work which had been recognised nationally as good practice and commended by the Chairman of the Standing Commission on Carers. The support of the group's Scrutiny Officer was commended.

2. The Cabinet Associate for Adult Social Care welcomed the recommendations of the group and noted that they had performed an excellent job in a short time-frame. He also thanked the officers who worked on it for their support.

Recommendations:

The Committee:

- Endorsed the recommendations of the Motion on Young Carers Research Group.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- None
- **Committee next steps:**
- None.

56/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 13]

1. The Chairman advised that the forward programme had recently finished. He proposed the following work plan priorities, identified by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman:

- Staffing and MySupportBroker Pilot and FFCS assessments
- Carers, including Care Act 2014 duties
- Model Office Practice and Surrey Choices
- Health and Wellbeing Board and Dementia Friendly Surrey

Recommendations:

The Committee:

- Noted the recommendations tracker and agreed the four work plan priorities for 2014/15.

Actions/further information to be provided:

- None
- **Committee next steps:**
- None.

57/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 14]

The Committee noted its next meeting would be 5 September 2014 at 10am.

Meeting ended at: 1.40 pm

Chairman