

## **Adult Social Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 January 2010**

### **Present:**

Ms D Irving (Chairman)

Mr D Callaby	Mr S Little
Miss C Casimir	Mr J Mooney
Mrs M Chapman-Allen	Mr J Perry-Warnes
Michael Chenery of Horsbrugh	Mr N Shaw
Mr T Garrod	Mrs A Thomas
Mr J Joyce	Mr A J Wright

### **Also Present:**

Mr D Harwood, Non-Voting Cabinet Member  
Mr B Long, Non-Voting Deputy Cabinet Member

### **Officers/Others:**

E McGrath, Age Concern, Norfolk  
Mary Ledgard, Norfolk LINK  
Bert Bremner, Member of Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council  
Georgina Moles, Member of Norwich City Council  
Julie Brociek-Coulton, Member of Norwich City Council  
Harold Bodmer, Director of Adult Social Services  
James Bullion, Assistant Director, Community Care, Adult Social Services  
Janice Dane, Head of Finance, Adult Social Services  
Mike Gleeson, Head of Democratic Support, Adult Social Services  
Jeremy Bone, Planning and Policy Officer, Adult Social Services  
Kathy Bonney, Head of HR and Organisational Development, Adult Social Services  
Colin Sewell, Head of Performance, Adult Social Services  
Mark Taylor, Programme Director for Integrated Provision, Adult Social Services  
Debbie Olley, Assistant Director, Integrated Services

### **Apologies for Absence:**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr P Hardy, Mr D Harrison, Mr M Kiddle-Morris and Ms J Mickleburgh.

## **1 Minutes**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 November 2009 were confirmed by the Panel and signed by the Chairman.

## **2 Chairman's Announcements**

### **(a) CareForce and the Provision of Homecare Services in Norwich**

Referring to Minute 9 of the previous meeting, the Chairman said that while the overall performance of CareForce continued to improve, there remained ongoing concerns about a number of quality assurance issues. She said that officers continued to monitor the situation and would be undertaking quality assurance visits over the next few weeks. She added that a briefing note on the outcome of these visits would be sent to Members, and a report presented to the next meeting of the Panel in March 2010.

### **(b) PRISM, the County Council's Performance Monitoring System**

The Chairman said that at the end of the meeting Members would have an opportunity to attend a short introduction to PRISM, the County Council's Performance Monitoring System.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

Ms D Irving declared a personal interest as a volunteer for the Norfolk and Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust.

Mrs A Thomas declared a personal interest because she was the South Norfolk Council representative on Saffron Housing Trust.

Mr A Wright declared a personal interest as a Member of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Mental Health Forum.

Michael Chenery of Horsburgh declared a personal interest because he had links with the Norfolk and Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust and he was also a Mental Health Practitioner.

Mr J Perry-Warnes declared a personal interest as a Member of the Friends of Kelling Hospital.

Mr S Little declared a personal interest as a Norwich City Council Member of the Norwich Access Group for the Disabled.

## **4 Items of Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **5 Public Questions**

There were no public questions.

## **6 Local Member Issues/Member Questions**

There were no local Member issues/Member questions.

## **7 Cabinet Member Feedback**

### **(a) Feedback from Cabinet Regarding the Future Commissioning Models – Community Care in Home Day Services**

### **(b) Feedback from Cabinet Regarding the Response to the Green Paper “Shaping the Future of Care Together”**

The annexed report by the Cabinet Member was received and noted.

It was noted that consultation with service users about the future commissioning models would take place in a number of different ways, including interviews undertaken independently with service users in day centres where it was proposed to no longer provide a service. It was too early at this stage to provide any form of assessment; Age Concern would be undertaking an independent assessment of the replies at the end of the consultation period. The Director agreed that local Members could attend day centres to observe interviews with service users, by request, and with the permission of service users.

It was noted that the Cabinet had agreed to delete words referring to “feedback from central government downwards” in the response to the Green Paper “Shaping the Future of Care Together”.

## **ITEMS FOR SCRUTINY**

## **8 Addendum Report – Compliments and Complaints**

The annexed report by the Director of Adult Social Services was received.

The Panel received a report that showed the Department had experienced a significant increase in the number of compliments during the period between March 2008 and March 2009. The report also gave examples of the types of complaints that Adult Social Services had received during the same period and illustrated how complaints had provided effective learning opportunities for the Department.

The inclusion in the report of illustrated examples was welcomed by Members. The examples showed that the Department took a positive approach to the recording of complaints and learnt lessons from them. By including examples, the report gave more detail than the Department was obliged to provide to the Panel as a statutory requirement. This was welcomed by Members who requested that all such reports should in future follow a similar format.

The increase in the number of compliments was welcomed by Members as a sign of staff working hard to achieve good relationships with service users.

In reply to detailed questions, it was pointed out that the Department no longer

commissioned 15 minute slots from external providers and that the Department was conducting a survey of providers to show how many staff were trained on safeguarding issues. Members were assured that additional training would be arranged where it was required.

## **9 Forward Work Programme – Scrutiny**

The annexed report by the Director of Adult Social Services was received.

The Panel received a report that summarised the scrutiny work programme and gave an update on progress.

The Panel noted that new topics for inclusion in the Scrutiny programme had to meet the criteria set out in paragraph 1.2 of the report.

In reply to detailed questions, it was pointed out that the Party Spokespersons meetings would be able to assess the scores that were provisionally applied to scrutiny topics before work began. A low score would not prevent an issue being scrutinised; the scores could be used for prioritisation purposes.

The Panel noted the current status of scrutiny items. In future update reports would continue to include the programme of Party Spokespersons meetings: the next one was due to be held on 3 February 2010. A list of such dates would be sent to Members.

### **OVERVIEW ITEMS**

## **10 Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring Report for 2009/10**

The annexed report by the Director of Adult Social Services was received.

The Panel received a report that provided current performance and finance monitoring information for 2009/10.

The Panel noted that the performance alerts at Appendix A needed to be explained and that Appendix C could be found at pages 72a to 72i of the agenda.

In reply to questions, it was pointed out that the budget sub-heading “Director of Finance” included a number of small underspends from the previous year as well as funding for meeting the Department’s legal costs and those of the Adult Social Services Finance Team.

It was noted that the Department remained on target to achieve its recovery plan at the end of the financial year. Members were, however, concerned about the slower than expected progress of the Department in supporting people to arrange and manage their own individual needs through self-directed support. It was pointed out that other local authorities were publicly expressing similar concerns. Norfolk was finding it difficult to meet its target because it had a larger than average number of older service users and older people were less likely to take up self-directed support.

The Panel noted that the Care Quality Commission (CQC) had completed its annual

performance assessment and assessed Norfolk Adult Social Services as “performing well.” Norfolk had achieved two outcomes of “excellent” and this compared favourably with the performance of other local authorities in the Eastern Region. The Panel were pleased with this result. In order to obtain a score of “excellent” Norfolk would need to be assessed as having four out of seven outcomes that were considered “excellent”.

## **11 Service and Financial Planning 2010-13**

The Panel received a report that updated Members on proposals for service and financial planning for 2010-11 to 2012-13. The report included information about the Provisional Grant Settlement, information from the Pre-Budget Report 2009, updated information on revenue budget proposals and capital funding bids and the latest information on the cash limited budget for services relevant to the Panel.

It was pointed out that the shortfall of savings mentioned in Appendix A to the report should include minus figures for the years 2011-12 and 2012-13, and that there should be corresponding changes in the figures for the cash limited budgets for these years.

Some concern was expressed by Members about approximately £5m of additional pressures on the Adult Social Services budget for 2010-11 in order to meet the costs of providing free personal care for those outside of residential care should this change be introduced from 1 October 2010. The Department of Health had issued a consultation document on this issue which had been put out for comments until the end of February 2010. The consultation document had been issued after the draft budget proposals for 2010-11 had been published. It was unknown at this stage how many additional people in Norfolk would be able to meet the criteria for free personal care. The issue was due to be reported to the Cabinet in March 2010.

It was pointed out that the County Council was working on the assumption that there would be a freeze on grant expenditure for 2011-12 onwards. Some Members said that due to the poor prospects for public spending, the County Council might in the future be forced into making expenditure cuts in grants to outside bodies.

The Panel noted the proposals contained within the report and the prioritised bids for capital funding, in order to inform Cabinet discussion at its meeting on 25 January 2010.

## **12 Norfolk’s Draft Joint Dementia Commissioning Strategy**

The annexed report by the Director of Adult Social Services was received.

The Panel received a report that set out Norfolk’s proposed Draft Joint Dementia Commissioning Strategy for dementia, Norfolk’s implementation plan in response to the requirements of the National Dementia Strategy published by the Department of Health in February 2009.

It was pointed out that day care centres played an important role in meeting the needs of those with dementia. Dementia day care provided a break for carers as well as those with dementia and more services were required for those with low level dementia needs. Only one third of people with dementia received a formal diagnosis at any time in their illness. More early diagnosis and signposting information and support services were required. Evidence given to the Health Overview and Scrutiny

Committee showed that dementia was extremely difficult to detect in its early stages and GPs needed more expertise in diagnosing the condition.

The Panel supported the proposed strategy, attached as an Appendix to the report, subject to a much stronger reference being made to the role of day care centres in meeting the needs of people with dementia.

### **13 Update on the Norfolk Integrated Care Pilots**

The annexed report by the Director of Adult Social Services was received.

The Panel received a report on the progress of the pilots of integrated care for older people and people with physical and sensory disabilities between Adult Social Services and NHS services provided by GPs and the provider arm of NHS Norfolk, Norfolk Community Health and Care (NCHC). The Panel also received with the agenda copies of a leaflet by the Department of Health that provided an introductory guide to the integrated care pilots.

The Panel asked for the pilots to be rolled out to the remainder of Norfolk when circumstances allowed.

It was pointed out that the pilots in Norfolk were larger than could be found elsewhere in the country. This meant that at some stage in the future it would be easier to roll them out in Norfolk than it would be elsewhere. The pilots provided cost benefits for all of the partners. The focus of the pilots in Norfolk was on joint working between the County Council and the NCHS, particularly on integrating care for the elderly. The pilots were due to come to an end in early 2011 and then be subject to an overall evaluation across the country.

The Panel gave their full support to the project and the aims to better integrate health and social care in Norfolk, and asked for the pilots to be rolled out to the remainder of Norfolk when circumstances allowed.

The meeting concluded at 1.15 pm

### **Chairman**



**If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Tim Shaw on 0344 8008020 or 0344 8008011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.**