

**To: All Members of the County Council
All Chief Officers**

**From: COUNTY SECRETARY'S
DEPARTMENT**

**cc: ACS officers)
Officers named for action) e-mail
Committee Section)**

**Ask for: Peter Hull
Ext: 25565
My Ref: PH/ahp
Your Ref:**

**ADULT CARE SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE
4 OCTOBER 2001**

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

E M Clarke, K J Coleman (Vice-Chairman), M Downing, F Guest, B J Lamb, R Mills (Chairman), J R Morton, D A A Peek, P A Ruffles, P A Webb

EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

J M Pitman, D Beatty.

Other Members in Attendance

D A Ashley, P T J Channell, J Gipps, M Green, T G M Kent, A Lee, D B Lloyd, R Mays, J T Metcalf, M H O'Neill, R Sanderson, R J Smith

Upon consideration of the agenda for the Adult Care Services Select Committee meeting on 4 October 2001, as circulated, copy annexed, action was taken or decisions were reached on individual items as recorded below.

INTRODUCTIONS

Clare Kaye, Assistant Chief Executive and Support Officer for this Select Committee, welcomed all concerned to the meeting, explained the purpose of the Select Committee and identified the members and officers involved with the Committee.

CHAIRMAN

Following the resignation of P A Webb as Chairman

RESOLVED

That R Mills be elected Chairman.

MINUTES**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 July 2001 be agreed as a correct record.

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**(a) Membership Changes**

Roma Mills replaced Jill Gipps on a permanent basis.

(b) Health Topic Group

The Chairman pointed out that the Health Topic Group followed this Select Committee at 2.00 p.m.

(c) Change of Date of March Adult Care Services Select Committee

The Chairman asked the Committee if the scheduled date of 14 March could be changed to Friday 15 March to enable her attendance.

It was AGREED that, subject to the availability of Members of the Select Committee, the March meeting be held at 2.00 p.m. on Friday 15 March, 2002

PUBLIC PETITIONS

No petitions were submitted.

QUESTIONS (STANDING ORDER SC8)**Questions to the Executive Member (Jane Pitman) from John Metcalf**

- Q1**
- (a) How much has so far been spent in social services staff-time in reviewing and recommissioning Home Care packages so that people in desperate need can have only those services which will keep them out of imminent and substantial risk and nothing more?*
 - (b) By how much will this reviewing and recommissioning exercise have increased waiting times for assessments (which are already at six months in some areas of the country)?*
 - (c) Given the great shortage of social services staff for core duties in some parts of the county, it is not wasteful that they have had to be diverted from those duties into this reviewing and recommissioning exercise caused by poor budgeting and budgetary control by the Cabinet?*

Answer:

People who meet the Eligibility Criteria (agreed by the last administration

-2-

in October 1997) and are in need of Home Care Services, do not need to wait. They receive an immediate assessment and care is arranged to keep them out of risk. This is not affected by staff reviewing and recommissioning Home Care Services.

There is not a simple correlation between the reviewing and recommissioning exercise and waiting times for assessment. Staff have not been diverted from care duties. Teams have designated reviewing officers who undertake reviews and District Commissioning Officers undertake the recommissioning for Home Care. There has not been an increase in the numbers of people awaiting assessment since the Home Care Action Plan was introduced.

Where there are people waiting for 6 months or more, they will have had an initial assessment and are likely to be waiting for special equipment or housing adaptations.

The new block contracts for Home Care have improved the availability and quality of Home Care. However, these benefits, together with an increase in demand, have put pressure on the budget (this is consistent with the National picture).

The budgetary control exercise has been effective. The fact that the overspend was identified in May and that the Home Care Action Plan was put in place immediately, has demonstrated prompt and effective budgetary control.

Supplementary Question from John Metcalf:

I accept and agree a need for a budget for home care services but did ask how much was being spent in Social Services staff time in reviewing and recommissioning home care packages. No sum of money has been included in the answer.

I accept the new budgetary system but can you also let me know what the overspend was projected to be. I understand £900,000 was identified against the Joint Investment Plan.

Answer:

Yes there was a £900,000 underspend for the first quarter broken down to £500,000.

The Chairman indicated that a written reply to the questions would be given with more details provided of specific issues raised.

(The following is the information requested in John Metcalf's Supplementary Question:-

"The Adult Care Services Department employs about 180 full-time equivalent front-line staff in its Elderly/Physical Disability teams, who undertake assessments and care management of clients. In addition, there

are 10 reviewing officers, whose sole task is the review of existing clients and the budget for these officers is £215,000.

The implementation of the Home Care Action Plan is through the regular reviews undertaken by the reviewing officers. Thus as each client comes up for review, consideration is given as to whether the amount or type of service commissioned needs to be changed. Roughly 400 reviews are undertaken each month.

In order to maximise the impact of the Home Care Action Plan, some reviews will have been brought forward and some delayed, but overall the same number of reviews are being completed and all clients will be reviewed. There are no additional costs.")

Question to the Executive Member (Jane Pitman) from Roma Mills

Q2 *At the meeting of the Adult Care Services Select Committee held on 22 March 2001, the Executive Member (Councillor Mrs Price) confirmed that the estimated underspends on schemes to be funded by Specific Grants in 2000/2001 totalled approximately £538,000 and commented that "We expect to be able to avoid slippage in 2001/2002 although circumstances*

sometimes make this unavoidable". The recent budget monitor considered by the Cabinet and Executive on 17 September 2001, reported a planned underspend of Specific Grant monies for 2001/2002 of approximately £342,000 planned underspend and indicated that these funds would be used to offset the overspend on Home Care.

Would the Executive Member indicate which schemes are affected by this planned underspend and why it is considered that it will not be possible to proceed with them within this municipal year?

Answer:

The estimated slippage in 2001/2002 included in the budget monitor considered by Cabinet and Executive on 17 September 2001 was £342,000 on a total specific grants budget of £11.674m i.e. 2.9% slippage.

The proposals are:-

- (a) Partnership with Health to strengthen and support hospital discharge (funded from Partnership grant). Health have had problems in recruiting OT's and Therapists. Underspend amounts to £50,000 on a budget of £256,000.
- (b) Community EMI Support Services (funded from Partnership grant). The lead organisation on this scheme is the Hertfordshire Partnership Trust. There have been delays in recruiting Health support staff working with Community Psychiatric nurses. Slippage is estimated to be £128,000 on a budget of £256,000.

- (c) The post of Project Manager (funded from Prevention grant) has not yet been filled. Including oncosts this amounts to a saving of £46,000. We are reviewing how best to use this resource to support rehabilitation.
- (d) Rehabilitation Scheme (funded from Promoting Independence grant). Proposals are being finalised and slippage on this scheme is estimated to be £25,000 on a budget of £50,000.
- (e) There have been delays in the start dates of various mental health schemes (funded from mental health grant). The total slippage amounts to around £40,000.

Since the vast majority of schemes funded from specific grants in 2000/2001 and 2001/2002 have now started, the £342,000 slippage identified to date will not increase by a significant amount.

PART I ('OPEN') BUSINESS

ACTIONS

1. HOSPITAL DISCHARGE ARRANGEMENT

[Officer contact: Peter Ruane, Tel: 01707 280760]
 Planning and Commissioning
 Manager (Older People and
 People with a Physical
 Disability) Adult Care Services
 Department

- 1.1 Arising from the Select Committee's work programme agreed at the meeting on 12 July 2001 a report was considered on hospital discharge arrangements in Hertfordshire particularly those affecting vulnerable older people. Sarah Pickup, Assistant Director Adult Care Services (Performance and Commissioning) presented the report of the Director of Adult Care Services which looked at the activity of the hospital social work teams and focussed on the concerns in respect of the number of "delayed discharges" and the joint work by health and Adult Care Services to address this.
- 1.2 The following representatives of users and the Health Service spoke in detail as to individual experiences, concerns and hopes for the future:-

-5-

Jill Peters, Chief Executive, North Herts and Stevenage PCT
Mark Jarvis, Hertfordshire Health Authority
Paula Hayden (Shirley, her carer) - Carers in Hertfordshire
Marion Birch - Age Concern
Mark Mitchell - Dacorum CVS
Gillian Cooper, Director of Nursing, West Herts Hospital

1.3 Summary of Users and Health Concerns

The presentations made by individual representatives raised the following common themes:

(a) Communications

Problems can arise or be exacerbated by difficult communications -

- (i) between agencies - health/social care and others
- (ii) within agencies - General Practitioners and clinical staff in hospitals.
- (iii) with users - where there are language and communications barriers for example.
- (iv) with carers - as to discharge planning, care planning and general information. It is important that professionals ensure that care arrangements are well understood by carers not merely that they have been explained.

(b) Funding

It was recognised that there was an overall shortage of care and alternative approaches were needed for people what are inappropriately occupying hospital beds.

(c) Attitudes and Approaches

The attitude towards older people in society as a whole was felt in some cases to be a barrier to implementing effective alternatives. Age discrimination in the provision of therapeutic services for example.

(d) Crisis Response (a number of issues around crisis situations arose:-

- (i) The difficulty in providing a quick response to changing circumstances where there was changes from residential to a need for a nursing home placement for example
- (ii) Care provision during holiday periods/unexpected changes/carer changes.
- (iii) Trigger points - factors other than the simple number of people in hospital no longer benefiting can cause a crisis. Complex additional factors are involved.
- (iv) Recruitment problems - are now a major problem.
- (e) Co-ordination

Between services:-

where discharge has been agreed but there is a delay to the patient going home can be caused by:

- ◆ transport, care packages and discharge times being not co-ordinated.
- ◆ waits for prescriptions.

Between agencies:-

- ◆ there was a need for agreement, definition and co-ownership of problems by health and social services.
- ◆ the reasons for differences in waiting times, and in different levels of admissions to residential and nursery care in other areas of the County. These may include interpretation of eligibility criteria, historical patterns, differences in approaches or facilities available.

-7-

(f) Alternatives

- ◆ More intermediate care/rehabilitation/therapy/extra care housing
- ◆ prevention of re-admission through thorough discharge planning .
- ◆ Avoiding admissions to hospitals in the first place. General Practitioners have a crucial role to play along with "hospital at home" type schemes.
- ◆ Alternatives to nursing/residential care were needed Part 2 1/2 - pre- residential care housing.
- ◆

1.4 Members were grateful to the representatives present in giving such direct experiences from the real issues concerning hospital discharge arrangements both good and bad. The Executive Member and Chairman endorsed these views.

1.5 AGREED:-

- (a) That the "next steps" outlined in paragraph 5.1 and summarised below be supported:-
- (i) That dealing with problems concerning delayed discharges be reported as a key priority for health and Adult Care Services in Hertfordshire. Efforts to improve and further develop the joint approach were enforced.
 - (ii) That it be noted that the situation was also being closely monitored by the NHS and Social Care region.
 - (iii) that joint work was taking place to develop intermediate care strategies and services involving independent residential and nursing home sector should continue.
 - (iv) that within Adult Care Services commissioning strategies are being reviewed for older people to assess whether the priorities are to commission more residential and nursing home places or develop alternatives such as extra care housing.

- (v) That it be noted that Adult Care Services were also working with representatives of the residential and nursing home sector to discuss a future price formula and consider contracting arrangements for nursing home beds in order to meet demand.
- (vi) further analysis be undertaken to explain the differences in actions for older people as between the East and North Herts Hospital Trust and the West Herts Hospital Trust.
- (vii) further details were set out in the Joint Investment Plan for Older People 2001/02

AGREED:-

- (a) to work hard on alternatives to improve hospital discharge arrangements.
- (b) recognise that, notwithstanding the hard work carried out, there remains some gaps in planning communication.
- (iii) It was further AGREED that a report come back to the Select Committee at its meeting in June 2002.

Caroline
Tapster Clare
Kaye

Caroline
Tapster Peter
Hull

2. JOINT INVESTMENT PLAN - SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE

[Officer contact: Peter Ruane, Tel: 01707 280760]
Planning and Commissioning
Manager (Older People and
People with a Physical
Disability) Adult Care Services
Department

2.1 Arising from the Select Committee's work programme agreed at the meeting on 17 July 2001 a report was considered on the progress on the Joint Investment Plan (Action Plan) focussing on the areas for development that had been most effective.

For the past three years, the Department of Health has required local and health authorities to set out their joint plans for improving services for older people. The plans must include proposals to invest in new services and respond to requirements within the NHS Plan. The JIP also needed to be consistent with County Council Best Value promises to promote independence, and work in partnership with other organisations to improve services.

2.2 Members Comments

Members made the following comments following consideration of the report:-

- ◆ It was felt that it would be useful to have an overall picture of the work/strategies of the Adult Care Services Department and to this end progress in implementing all four Joint Investment Plans would be considered by Spokesmen within each quarter with each plan to be scrutinised by the Adult Care Services Select Committee once a year.
- ◆ Joint working with Primary Care Trusts was felt to be of paramount importance and the officers were asked to request reports from the Adult Care Services representatives on the PCT Boards on how joint working was progressing.
- ◆ There was great support for the importance of rehabilitation/care at home and support for links with district councils.
- ◆ Herts Direct web development (Item 12) - it was felt that work to develop web based information and services for Adult Care Services should include the links to information on voluntary sector funding referred to in the Best Value report and in particular to the Hertfordshire External Resources Network (HERN) website.
- ◆ That work be welcomed on the efforts to achieve single assessments and speedy implementation be encouraged.

2.3 AGREED:-

That quarterly monitoring reports on all four Joint Investment Plan (JIP) be discussed with spokesmen and one monitoring report for all four plans/strategies be discussed at an appropriate meeting of the Adult Care Services in 2002.

Clare Kaye
Caroline
Tapster
Peter Hull

4. BEST VALUE REVIEW OF VOLUNTARY SECTOR FUNDING PROCESSES

[Officer contact: Keith Shepherd, Tel: 01992 555368]
Corporate Consultancy

4.1 Executive Committee Decision - 17 September 2001

“Noted that the outcome of the Best Value Review Voluntary Sector funding processes” be discussed at the Resources, Prosperity, Partnership and Consultation Select Committee; and Adult Care Services Select Committee in the autumn.

The Chairman indicated that any comments made by the Select Committees would be reported to Cabinet for consideration.

4.2 Comments of Adult Care Services Select Committee to Cabinet

That the Resources, Prosperity, Partnership and Consultation Select Committee and the Cabinet be informed of the following comments:-

- (i) there was concern that the expectation of new money coming from external funding should not disadvantage/cause an extra burden to voluntary organisations.
- (ii) there was concern that targets for external funding were unrealistic.
- (iii) there should be an assurance that organisations would not automatically lose their funding from Herts County Council at the end of the three-five year funding period.
- (iv) there were concerns that web site developments could compromise confidentiality of some organisations. The importance of ensuring adequate data protection and compliance with Caldicott guidance rules was endorsed..
- (v) the website should include details of the voluntary organisations Herts County Council is funding other voluntary organisations and arrangements with other partners e.g. District Councils and the NHS.

Anne Fisher
Clare Kaye
Keith Sheppard
Peter Hull
Sally-Ann Cole

REPORT TO COUNTY COUNCIL

No items were reported to the County Council.

-11-

Andrew Laycock
County Secretary