

Adult Social Care Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting Held on 12 October 2015
10:00am Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

Present:

Ms S Whitaker (Chair)

Mr B Borrett

Ms J Brociek –Coulton

Mr D Crawford

Mr T Garrod

Mr A Grey

Ms E Morgan

Mr J Perkins

Mr G Plant

Mr A Proctor

Mr W Richmond

Mr M Sands

Mr E Seward

Mrs M Stone

Mrs A Thomas

Mr B Watkins

Mr A White

Also present: Mr J Joyce, Mr D Roper, Mrs M Strong, and Mr G Nobbs

Chair's Announcements: The Chair announced that item 15 would be taken before item 10.

1. Apologies

- 1.1 Apologies were received and accepted from Michael Chenery of Horsbrugh (substituted by Anthony White).

2. To agree the minutes from the meeting held on 9 September 2015

- 2.1 The minutes from the meeting held on 9 September 2015 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

3. Members to Declare Any Interests

- 3.1 There were no interests declared.

4. To receive any items of urgent business

- 4.1 No items of urgent business were received.

5. Local Member Issues

- 5.1 No local member issues were received.

6. Update from Members of the Committee regarding any internal and external bodies that they sit on

- 6.1 Elizabeth Morgan reported that she had attended a meeting of the Norfolk Older People Strategic Partnership which launched their 'Living Longer Living Well' campaign. She had also been to a strategy group of the Norfolk Community Health & Care NHS Trust shadow governors and to the Norfolk Learning Disabilities champion board as member champion.
- 6.2 Brian Watkins had attended the AGM of the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital.
- 6.3 Julie Brociek-Coulton had attended the performance and placement task and finish group at the James Paget Hospital.
- 6.4 Jim Perkins reported that he attended a board meeting at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at King's Lynn.
- 6.5 The Chair reported that she had attended a meeting of Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust Council of Governors

7. Executive Director's Update

- 7.1 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services reported that the priority of the department had continued to be managing the in year budget pressures.
- 7.2 The department had hosted the first of a series of Health and Social Care transformation events with John Oldham leading the session. All organisations were committed to carrying out further work together.

8. Chair's Update

- 8.1 The Chair reported to the Committee that she had attended;
- a meeting with Kerry Wright, interim Head of Learning Difficulties
 - a meeting with Sue Hobbs, Strategy Manager for Young Carers (along with Cllr James Joyce),
 - a round table discussion in London organised by Localis on the future of Adult Social Care
 - the launch of dementia friendly community in Downham Market
 - Norfolk Carers Support AGM
 - three briefings with Deputy Leader on 2016/17 budget
 - two meetings of Chairs, Leader, MD and Directors with regards to devolution and refugee crisis

- a meeting of Syrian Refugees Taskforce
- a seminar organised by Shropshire Council on organisation of 'front door'.

9. Exercise of Delegated Authority

- 9.1 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services reported that the business plan for the new care village at Bowthorpe had been agreed. The village would include Housing with Care and dementia units. Residents would transfer from the current four homes to the new village.

10. Re-Imagining Norfolk: Service and Financial Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

- 10.1 The annexed report (15) by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received by the Committee. The report set out details of the model of service delivery which would be required to enable the department to operate on a budget of 75% of its addressable spend.
- 10.2 The Committee reviewed each proposal in turn. With regards to proposal 1a – Promoting Independence: Customer Pathway, the following points were made;
- a) There was concern from some of the Committee regarding the scale of savings proposed and the realistic aim of achieving those savings as they were considerably high cost and high risk.
 - b) The community capacity was not the same across the County, and therefore there would have to be support available for people to ensure they were connected with the resources available by working with the Districts and the voluntary sector.
 - c) The Committee questioned the service reduction, and it was confirmed that the service would be reduced by 14% by the end of year 3, with an overall aim of 22% in the extended 5 year programme.
 - d) Although the Committee acknowledge the aspiration of the proposal there was concern about the delivery of the services in the timescales specified.
 - e) It was recognised that the 'Promoting Independence' initiative needed further work and therefore it would affect the RAG rating and achievement of service delivery.
- 10.3 The following points were made regarding proposal 1b - Promoting Independence - Reablement;
- a) It was clarified that the proposed saving would be achieved from the purchase of care as the capacity of the Reablement service would be increased.
- 10.4 The following points were made regarding proposal 1c - Promoting Independence – Housing with Care;
- a) Although the Committee acknowledged that this proposal had the right approach, there were concerns that it would need a substantial of Housing with Care in the County and a considerable amount of investment to change.
 - b) The Committee expressed concern at the Green RAG rating as achieving the savings would be dependent on partner organisations delivering their objectives and therefore was outside of the control of Norfolk County Council.
- 10.5 There were no comments made by the Committee on proposal 1d; Integrated Community Equipment Service (ICES).

- 10.6 The following points were made on proposal 2 - Reduce Training and Development spend following implementation of Promoting Independence
- a) In response to a question from the Committee why all the savings to be made in year 2, Officers confirmed that this was because it would require a cultural change and would take time to take effect.
 - b) The savings seemed modest when undertaking so much proposed change and the proposal seemed a false economy.
- 10.7 The following points were made on proposal 3 - Move service mix to Average of Comparator Family Group or Target – All Specialism
- a) The Committee questioned the Amber RAG rating.
- 10.8 The following points were made on proposal 4 - refocus Supporting People provision to support Promoting Independence Phase 1
- a) The savings would be in year 1 as it reflected the push to see deliverable savings as soon as possible. They were contracted services that could be given notice or reframed quickly.
 - b) Members felt that the service should concentrate on preventative measures rather than introduce proposals such as this.
 - c) The proposal was completely undeliverable, and should not have been considered. It was an area that had already seen major cuts in the past. It had been given a Red RAG rating due to the potential impact. This proposal was unacceptable.
 - d) It was recognised that there would be financial implications to the budget if this wasn't implemented as it represented 50% of the Year 1 savings.
- 10.9 The following points were made on proposal 5 - Radical Review of Daycare Services
- a) More detail was requested on what the service would look like if the proposal was implemented. Although it was expected that there would still be buildings-based provision, the service would need to change radically.
 - b) It was acknowledged by the Committee that this was a vague proposal; and needed more detail before reductions could be agreed to.
 - c) Service would need to be promoted in the community. It was clarified that work would be carried out to work in partnership with other organisations to help people into employment opportunities. There was some work being undertaken in this area but not enough.
 - d) The Committee agreed that there was not enough information to say if the proposal would work
 - e) The Committee agreed with the RAG rating for this proposal
- 10.10 The following points were made on proposal 6 - Phase out all transport provision to service users
- a) Members commented that service users would need transport support, and this proposal was impractical and ill-advised. Officers confirmed that there was a current project looking at to reducing transport spend locality by locality, transport use was being analysed looking at who was travelling, why, and if there was a most cost-effective alternative.
 - b) The Committee agreed that these savings would not be possible without affecting service users considerably and therefore would not be agreed.
 - c) It was confirmed that Cornwall, as a rural County, had achieved success implementing a similar approach of empowering service users to source their

own transport using their mobility budgets. A 'Trusted Trader' type scheme would be set up to provide a list of reliable transport providers.

- 10.11 There were no points made on proposal 7 - Move service mix to Lowest of Comparator Family Group – All Specialism
- 10.12 Proposal 8 (Refocus Supporting People provision to support Promoting Independence Phase 2) was unacceptable to the Committee – see comments on proposal 4.
- 10.13 The following points were made regarding proposal 9 - Restrict access to services to get to 75% target – all specialism.
- a) The Committee drew attention to the paragraph in the report which stated that if the proposal was implemented it could potentially leave Norfolk County Council open to legal challenge.
 - b) The Committee would not recommend this proposal.
- 10.14 The Committee **RESOLVED**;
- To consider and comment on the service delivery model required to provide the service within a budget of 75% of addressable spend, set out in section 2.
 - To consider and comment for Policy and Resources Committee consideration the list of savings proposals, including initial RAG rating, which are to be considered by Policy and Resources Committee on 26 October with a view to consulting with the public.

The Committee adjourned for 35 minutes and resumed at 1.35pm.

11. Adult Social Care Finance Monitoring Report Period 5 (August) 2015-16

- 11.1 The annexed report (10) by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received by the Committee. The report provided the Committee with financial monitoring information, based on information to the end of August 2015. It provided an analysis of variations from the revised budget and recovery actions taken in year to reduce the overspend.
- 11.2 Although there was concern that reserves were being used to balance the budget which would continually leave limited amount for future use, the Executive Director of Adult Social services confirmed that no more funds from reserves were being used than had been agreed when the budget was set earlier in the year.
- 11.3 The Committee questioned why the overall numbers of residential placements had stopped falling yet no new residential placements had been made for adults aged under 65. It was clarified that this could be due to the current model achieving its maximum reduction but the levelling off was being monitored.
- 11.4 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note;
- The forecast outturn position at period 5 for 2015-16 Revenue Budget of an overspend of £5.608m.
 - The planned recovery actions being taken in year to reduce the overspend.
 - The planned use of reserves.

- The forecast outturn position at period 5 for the 2015-16 Capital Programme.
- The overspend action plan at 2.8.

12. Performance Monitoring Report

- 12.1 The annexed report (11) by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received by the Committee. The report presented quarter 1 performance results with a performance dashboard, and updated the Committee on a corporate view of performance management arrangements.
- 12.2 It was noted that there had been a miscoding of temporary and permanent mental health admissions prior to the management of the mental health service being transferred back to Norfolk County Council which had altered the figures.
- 12.3 The Committee requested that any performance measures that had been discussed previously and any updated measures should be identified in the report.
- 12.4 It was clarified that the figures for 2014/2015 for family group average in appendix B of the reports had been embargoed and therefore hadn't been published for the Committee's consideration. It was reported that once the restriction had been lifted, the figures would be available to the Committee.
- 12.5 The Committee requested that the admission avoidance numbers be measured to ensure the preventative measures in place were effective. Due to the Promoting Independence strategy being implemented shortly, the numbers were at a standstill position but there would be more detailed data available in future.
- 12.6 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Review and comment on the performance management information, including the Dashboard presented in Appendix A.
 - Review and comment on the proposed targets in Appendix B.
 - Consider any areas of performance that required a more-in-depth analysis.
 - Proposed any specific changes or improvements to performance reporting in the light of likely changes to the performance report for 2015/16 in response to Promoting Independence and other factors.

13. Risk Management

- 13.1 The annexed report (12) by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received by the Committee. The report included the departmental risk summary together with an update on progress since 9 September 2015.
- 13.2 It was hoped that implementation of the Promoting Independence strategy would be positive for social workers and similar professionals, as there was concern at the risk to staff morale and well-being. The Executive Director clarified that social workers had been assured that they would have the support of the department when making changes to service user's personal budgets providing they had been carried out professionally.
- 13.3 There were risk assessments undertaken on personal budgets and amendments

- made if necessary to prevent service users being put at an unacceptable risk.
- 13.4 The Committee expressed their support to the social workers in the difficult job that they carry out.
- 13.5 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Note the progress with departmental risks since 9 September 2015
 - Comment on progress with departmental risks since 9 September 2015.
 - Consider if any further action is required.
 - Note the change in risk for RM13929 – The speed and severity of change, from Green to Amber.
- 14. Feedback from the Performance and Placement Rate Task and Finish Group**
- 14.1 The annexed report (13) by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received by the Committee. The report set out the work of the performance and placement rate task and finish group to date.
- 14.2 There had been a delay in organising the first meeting and although there was a short timescale for the future meetings to achieve the work, the timescale could be adjusted if needed as the group progressed-
- 14.3 The group expressed their thanks to Officers for their presentation at the first meeting of the group, and for co-coordinating the meeting.
- 14.4 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Note the report.
- 15. The Cost of Care in Adult Social Services – interim report**
- 15.1 The annexed report (14) by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received.
- 15.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Consider the revised timetable to enable it to retake its decision of 9 March regarding the prices the Council would usually expect to pay for residential and nursing care in Norfolk for the 2015/16 financial year.

Meeting finished at 2.30pm.

CHAIR



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.