

# Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

## Scrutiny Board Inquiry: Adaptations

Working Group Meeting: 6 October 2008

**Present: Members**  
Cllr. Judith Chapman (Chair)  
Cllr. Debra Coupar  
Joy Fisher (co-opted member)  
Sally Morgan (co-optee member)

### Officers

Andy Beattie (Head of Service (Pollution Control and Housing))  
Colin Moss (Adaptations Agency Manager)  
Liz Ward (Disability Service Manager)  
Simeon Perry (Housing Policy and Monitoring Manager)  
Mandy Askham (East North East Homes Leeds)  
Steven Courtney (Principal Scrutiny Adviser)

**Apologies** Cllr. Stuart Andrew  
Cllr. Suzi Armitage  
Helen Freeman (Chief Officer (Health & Environmental Action Service))

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1	<b>Attendance</b> The attendance and apologies as above were noted.	
2	<b>Background</b> <p>At the meeting in June 2008, Members of the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) identified 'Adaptations' as a potential area for a more detailed inquiry. The Board was subsequently advised that a previous scrutiny inquiry on adaptations had been undertaken and published in October 2002 and a copy of the previous inquiry report was provided to all members of the Board.</p> <p>At its meeting in September 2008, the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) considered a report which outlined the current arrangements for the delivery of adaptations in Leeds. The Scrutiny Board recognised and acknowledged that progress had been made in this regard since the previous scrutiny inquiry in 2003; however, the Scrutiny Board was keen to ensure that the Council was providing good customer service and receiving value for money as part of the delivery of adaptations to the homes of disabled people and their families. As such, the Board established a working group to examine the delivery of adaptations in more detail.</p> <p>To assist members of the working group undertaking this inquiry, the following papers were provided prior to the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Scrutiny Board report on Adaptations – 17 September 2008 ;</li><li>▪ Draft Terms of Reference;</li><li>▪ The Ombudsman report and associated action plan (Executive Board</li></ul>	

	<p>report – 23 January 2008);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The update action plan (June 2008);</li> <li>▪ Eligible works for Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) guidance note – 18 June 2007;</li> <li>▪ Provision of Extensions to meet the needs of disabled people guidance note – 21 January 2008;</li> <li>▪ Proposals for establishing an Adaptations Appeal Panel – 3 April 2008</li> <li>▪ Prioritisation definitions (Adult Social Care);</li> <li>▪ Activity data on assessments by Disability Service Teams in Adult Social Care</li> </ul>	
3	<p><b>Draft terms of reference</b></p> <p>There was a general discussion on the draft terms of reference, where members agreed that the focus of the inquiry would be on adaptations for disabled adults. Specific comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The need for more explicit reference to issues around equality – particularly relating to equality across housing tenure.</li> <li>➤ A general consideration of ‘well being for the individual’ within the overall context of providing adaptations.</li> <li>➤ Housing lettings issues within the context of providing adaptations.</li> </ul> <p>It was outlined that the draft terms of reference, along with the comments made by the working group would be reported to the full Scrutiny Board at its October meeting for approval.</p>	SMC
4	<p><b>Ombudsman report and action plan</b></p> <p>There was a general discussion around the presented report and the circumstances surrounding the individual case it focused on. It was confirmed that a copy of the Council’s action plan in response to the recommendations in the report had been sent to the Ombudsman, but no formal feedback had been received.</p> <p>Further discussion centred around the involvement of Mr. E (referred to in the Ombudsman’s report) in the Council’s response to the recommendations. It was outlined that the main area of involvement had been in the development of proposals to adopt a more proactive approach to adaptations where disabled people had complex needs (i.e. a case management approach), which included proposals to establish an appeals process/ panel. One of the main aims of the appeals panel was to resolve conflict.</p> <p>It was outlined that the appeals panel had held its first meeting, with initial proposals to meet monthly to address any specific concerns/ cases currently in the system. Following the initial period, bi-monthly appeals panels meetings were anticipated. It was reported that the frequency of such meetings need to balance the needs of individuals and the associated costs of administering the appeals meeting process. It was reported that there were currently 3 appeals cases pending.</p> <p>It was stated that the Council’s view of the proposed appeals process was relatively informal yet robust, and provided the opportunity for constructive discussion. It was stated that Mr. E’s view had been that a more formal process was required (i.e. perhaps involving legal representatives). However, it was also outlined that the current arrangements had only</p>	

	<p>recently been introduced and a period of time was needed in order to assess its effectiveness. As a such, a review of the current proposals would be undertaken at an appropriate time to ensure they were fit for purpose.</p> <p>It was agreed that further information of the 'case management approach' be presented to a future meeting of the working group.</p> <p>The working group discussed aspects of the assessment process where it was outlined that Occupational Therapists are responsible for assessing what is necessary and appropriate to meet the needs of an individual. It was also necessary within the assessment process to determine / make a judgement about reasonable and practicable adaptations. The working group was reminded that the first option was always to consider how the existing property could be adapted or enhanced to meet the needs of the disabled person. Members also discussed the level of funding available to provide adaptations and the role of means testing within the DFG process. It was agreed that a more detailed report on this be provided to the next working group meeting.</p> <p>It was stressed that there was a considerable (and growing) demand for adaptations and the working group also discussed the level of support provided to individuals seeking an adaptation. This included the use of advocates and the potential of different individuals to act as 'advocates' – ranging from social workers, customer support officers (within the adaptations agency), dedicated advocates and councillors.</p> <p>There was also some discussion around the adaptations framework launched in 2006 to ensure that customers requiring adaptations in the public sector would get a broadly consistent service irrespective of the ALMO responsible for delivering the service.</p> <p>It was agreed that this would be discussed in more detail at the next meeting, including an outline of any operational developments/ differences within each ALMO.</p>	<p>LW</p> <p>AB/ CM</p> <p>SP</p>
5	<p><b>Determination of risk</b></p> <p>A short paper providing prioritisation definitions for recommendations made by Social Care to Adaptations Agency and ALMOs. The staff guidance note, Eligibility Criteria Guide for community care services was also circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>It was highlighted that the 'Low, Medium and High' categories were in line with guidance provided by Communities and Local Government and were not the preferred terminology. It was stressed that up-front discussions with individuals regarding the level of need/ risk, took place at an early stage in the assessment process.</p> <p>Queries regarding the involvement of an advocate/ champion acting on behalf of the individual were raised. It was agreed that a further paper on the involvement of named social workers within the adaptations process be presented to the next meeting.</p>	LW
6	<p><b>Low level need/ risk</b></p> <p>The working group was presented with a short report that presented activity</p>	

	<p>data on the assessments undertaken by the Disability Service Teams within Adult Social Care.</p> <p>The report outlined that Occupational Therapists (OTs) in Adult Social Care carry out assessments that lead to a range of services being provided, including equipment from Leeds Community Equipment Service and adaptations to properties. Adaptations could be provided via the ALMO, Adaptations Agency or Housing Association.</p> <p>The report also highlighted that interventions by OT and OT assistants can also lead to moving and handling advice and training, to general advice and information and signposting to other services. Data showing the number of face to face assessments and assessments undertaken over the telephone during the first 5 months of 2008/9 was set out in the report, along with the expected level of activity for the full year.</p> <p>Details provided in the report were discussed, with the following points emerging:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The provision of general advice on adaptations, and in particular the availability of advice and support for hard to reach groups;</li> <li>➤ The role of 'care and repair' in the delivery of minor aids and adaptations;</li> <li>➤ Reference was made to the Leeds assistive Technology Hub project – a more detailed paper was requested for the next meeting.</li> </ul>	LW
7	<p><b>Next Steps and future meeting dates</b></p> <p>The following meeting dates/ times were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 November 2008 @ 10:00am</li> <li>• 16 December 2008 @ 10.00am</li> </ul> <p>Arrangements for the above meetings to be finalised, with the additional information detailed above to be provided ASAP.</p>	SMC

# Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

## Scrutiny Board Inquiry: Adaptations

**Working Group Meeting: 4 November 2008**

**Present: Members**

Cllr. Judith Chapman (Chair)  
Cllr. Stuart Andrew  
Joy Fisher (co-opted member)  
Sally Morgan (co-opted member)

**Officers**

Helen Freeman (Chief Officer (Health & Environmental Action Service))  
Andy Beattie (Head of Service (Pollution Control and Housing))  
Colin Moss (Adaptations Agency Manager)  
Liz Ward (Disability Service Manager)  
Simeon Perry (Housing Policy and Monitoring Manager)  
Mandy Askham (East North East Homes Leeds)  
Richard Corbishley, Aire Valley Homes Leeds  
Rob Huntley, Belle Isle Tenant Management Organisation  
Steven Courtney (Principal Scrutiny Adviser)

**Apologies:** Cllr. Debra Coupar

Cllr. Suzi Armitage

Nesreen Lowson, West North West Homes Leeds

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1	<b>Attendance</b> The attendance and apologies as above were noted. The Chair expressed disappointment that a representative from West North West Homes Leeds was not present at the meeting.	
2	<b>Notes of Previous Meeting – 6 October 2008</b> The draft notes of the meeting were presented. It was noted that these required further work and would be completed as soon as practicable.	SMC
3	<b>Matters arising from meeting held on 6 October 2008</b> It was noted that there were a number of matters arising from the meeting/ discussion held on 6 October 2008. These were considered as follows: <u>3.1 Entry criteria / social worker allocation</u> A report was presented that set out issues associated with access to social worker support in the adaptations process. It was reported that adults with eligible social care needs can receive assessment and on going care management from a number of services depending on their presenting needs. Defined 'entry' criteria which describes the circumstances in which various social worker teams work with an individual was presented and discussed. It was highlighted that the level of support provided related to the needs	

of individuals rather than the type of service required. As such, there was no automatic access to social worker support as part of the adaptations process. This was presented as being neither possible nor desirable.

However, it was highlighted that the Housing Options for Disabled People case management approach (to be discussed as a separate item) requires social worker support or advocacy is considered.

### 3.2 Case Management Approach

The working group was presented with a report '*Housing Options for Disable People – A case management approach*'. The report outlined that since the previous Scrutiny inquiry in 2002, service improvements have been put in place across the Council to improve the speed of service delivery across all tenures. It was acknowledged that the availability of resources can impede speed of delivery, but outlined that the processes applied to the delivery of the majority of adaptations, (for example showers and stairlifts) had been refined in all agencies in order to be as efficient as possible.

Nonetheless, it recognised that for some disabled people providing housing that meets their physical access needs, and other family requirements, can only be achieved by complex, often high cost, schemes of adaptations. It outlined that, in some circumstances, re-housing needed to be considered, but the potential impact on all family members affected by such a major decision needed to be taken into account.

The report also detailed that following an ombudsman investigation (2007) into a family's experience of the adaptation process where the family required both re housing and a high cost scheme of adaptations, it was agreed to develop an improved approach (as presented) for such situations.

It was recognised that the approach presented had been developed with input from a number of key stakeholders, including the complainant and his advocate. The proposed approach and defined stages were the subject of detailed discussion, with the following points highlighted:

- Historically, the Council had been less successful dealing with disabled people with complex needs.
- In cases where disabled people needed to consider re-housing as an option to help meet their needs, this needed to be recognised as a very significant life event in, what can be, very difficult and traumatic circumstances. As such, in such circumstances, performance targets should perhaps be considered as a secondary issue.
- Instances where the case management approach might be appropriate included:
  - Evidence that the works which are "necessary and appropriate" for the disabled person and family, may not be "reasonable and practicable" to achieve in the property.
  - High cost/multiple adaptations required and family want to

consider re housing

- High cost /multiple adaptations above £20,000
  - Possible that a significant extension to the property is required in order to provide accessible facilities
  - Family requesting extension to property, including where it appears the facilities can be provided within the existing space, but family wish to build extension as “preferred scheme” with DFG paid as a contribution to the cost
  - Other circumstances requiring detailed multi agency co-ordination
- The ‘co-ordinator’ role as part of the case management approach, acting on behalf of all council services to ensure every complex case is tracked and performance managed to a successful conclusion.
- It was stressed by the working group that all agencies involved in the adaptations process needed to sign-up to such a co-ordinated approach – which may include establishing a jointly funded post.
- It was highlighted that for all adaptations, and in particular those involving complex needs, all stakeholders needed to demonstrate their commitment, with clear lines of accountability in terms of owning and managing specific cases.

### 3.3 Assistive Technology Hub

A report was presented that was described as setting out the long-term vision that will help disabled people and their families access the range of assistive technology (AT) services available across the City.

It was recognised that Leeds has a comprehensive range of AT services hosted across a range of (both health and social care) organisations in the statutory and non statutory sector. However, it was highlighted that, despite improvements, including the integrated community equipment service and increased access routes across agencies into each others services, the whole system currently lacks coherence and is often difficult for disabled people and their families to navigate.

It was outlined that AT services need to be recognised as an important element of reformed and personalised services where disabled people exercise choice and control. The working group was presented with a diagram detailing a range of service points that disabled people and their families can currently access to help ensure their needs are met. It recognised that a number of relationship between a number of service points already existed, through both formal an informal arrangements. However, the concept of ‘the Hub’ was one of a central co-ordinating mechanism to link all the available services.

The report also outlined a number of elements that needed to be developed to allow ‘the Hub’ to function, such as:

- Assistive technology specialist advisors;

- Single point of contact;
- An established Housing Options for Disable People case management approach – as detailed above.

The report also highlighted that between 2008/09 and 2010/11, Leeds will receive £7.28M Social Care Reform Grant. The purpose of this grant includes joining up services to *'...to provide easy to recognise access points, which co-ordinate or facilitate partner organisations to meet the needs of individuals'*.

Aspects of the report were discussed in some detail, with the following points being made:

- The development as presented should be recognised as an ambitious customer service improvement with great potential;
- The success of such a development is likely to be greatly enhanced by the early involvement of service users;
- Queries regarding the involvement/ potential role of the Citizen's Advice Bureau (CAB) in the development;
- The need to establish mechanisms to allow/ collate long-term feedback from service users;

#### 3.4 Test of resources (private sector)

The working group was presented with a report that provided some specific information regarding the test of resources element within the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) process.

The report outlined that the current test of resources or "means test" for DFG applicants is carried out under the Council's duties contained in Section 30 of the Housing Grants, Regeneration and Construction Act 1996, which was accompanied by Government's guidance (Circular 17/96) that provides detailed advice on the correct procedures for local authorities to follow when carrying out a test of resources.

It was highlighted that the legislation applied to all local authorities which meant that a disabled person making a grant application will be assessed to have the same level of contribution regardless of their location in the country. It was reinforced that, given its legislative status, the Council had no discretion when applying the test of resources as part of the DFG application process.

It was also highlighted that the test of resources was solely used to determine the level of contribution that an applicant must pay before grant monies become available. As such, the test of resources and therefore the level of contribution was not linked to the type, extent or overall cost of the adaptation.

Members of the working group were advised that the Adaptations Agency carries out an initial means test at the beginning of the grant delivery process, following receipt of a referral from Adult Social Care. Should an applicant decide to proceed with their application, a final test of resources is undertaken immediately prior to formal approval of the grant (as demanded by the law).

It was stated that, when introducing the test of resources, the



Government's view was that the contribution was a figure that represented a loan taken over a 10 year period that they felt an applicant could afford to pay. As such, where an applicant has a contribution over £2000, they are informed of the potential to take out Home Appreciation Loan with the Council. Any loaned amount is registered as a land charge against the equity in the applicant's property and is only reclaimed by the Council when the property is sold.

The working group were advised that over the preceding 12 months, the Agency had received 1563 referrals from Adult Social Care for grant aid. Of this number, 489 were child cases or Housing Association applications and were exempt from means testing. Of the remaining 1074 cases:

- 92 applicants (8.5%) withdrew due to the means test procedure or as a result of their contribution.
- 770 applicants (71.8%) were means tested and had a nil contribution.
- 212 applicants ( 19.7 %) were identified with a contribution and continued with their grant through to completion.

A summary of the 212 grant applicants where a contribution was required was provided as follows:

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Number of applicants</b>	<b>Percentage of applicants</b>
£1 to £500	87	41%
£500 to £999	30	14%
£1,000 to £1,999	55	26%
£2,000 to £4,999	28	13%
£5,000 to £9,999	10	5%
Over £10,000	2	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>100%</b>

The working group discussed the information presented, where the following points were discussed:

- It was confirmed that the maximum DFG was £30k.
- It was recognised that this was a complex and sensitive area, however the longer-term impact of individuals withdrawing from the DFG process on the basis of cost was questioned. It was recognised that a withdrawn application rate of around 10% was not insignificant.
- In cases involving Housing Association properties, it was confirmed that the Council contributed 60% of the total cost, with Housing Associations contributing 40%.
- Where properties were deemed unsuitable for adaptations, these were referred to Adult Social Care and re-housing was considered.

	<p>It was envisaged that the case management approach (referred to above) would help to resolve such cases more speedily.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Where disabled people move home, they can re-apply for an adaptation and associated grant. Such cases are treated as new applications.</li> <li>➤ It was confirmed that any adaptation costing less than £1000, was classed as a 'minor adaptation'. Any adaptation over £1000 was classed as a 'major adaptation'. All major adaptations within the private sector were referred to the DFG process.</li> </ul> <p>The information was noted and it was agreed this would be considered in preparation of the inquiry report.</p>	
4	<p><b>Adaptations framework</b></p> <p>The working group was presented with a short report that detailed the background to the development of the adaptations framework.</p> <p>It was highlighted that the main driver behind the development of the framework was to ensure that customers requiring adaptations in the public sector would receive a consistent service, irrespective of their location in the City, and covers common areas such as receiving referrals from Social Care. As an example, the Policy, Procedures and Framework document (March 2008) for the Adaptations Services of East North East Homes Leeds was appended to the report.</p> <p>It was reported that having a common framework had enabled benchmarking of performance by both the Strategic Landlord and individual ALMOs on both outputs and processes. However, it was noted that a more sophisticated performance regime was required. This, in part, would help the Council respond to increasing customer expectations and understand issues associated with those cases dealing with multiple and complex needs.</p> <p>The report also contained some examples of specific procedures and processes development by individual ALMOs. These were not discussed in detail and it was agreed, in part due to time constraints at the meeting, to defer further consideration of this item until the next working group meeting.</p> <p>It was also agreed that an updated report, reflecting comments from each ALMO would be submitted to the working group.</p>	SP/ SMC
5	<p><b>Performance levels</b></p> <p>A short paper on performance levels was presented to the working group, reminding members of the performance information presented to the Scrutiny Board on 17 September 2008. In addition, performance data for the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2008/09 was presented in a new format.</p> <p>Members were invited to comment on the new format of the performance report and asked to explore any specific performance issues in more detail.</p> <p>Due to time constraints of the meeting, it was agreed to defer consideration of this item until the next working group meeting, where</p>	HF/ SMC

	an updated report would be submitted.	
6	<b>Next steps</b> It was agreed to invite the appropriate Executive Board members, Councillor Les Carter and Councillor Peter Harrand, to a future meeting of the working group.	SMC
7	<b>Future meetings dates</b> It was noted that the next meeting would be held on 15 December 2008 at 10.00am. The precise venue for the meeting to be confirmed.	SMC

Draft

## ADAPTATIONS WORKING GROUP

MONDAY, 15<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER, 2008

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Chapman in the Chair

Councillors - S Andrew, JL Carter, P Harrand  
Officers – H Freeman, C Moss, M Askham, E  
Ward, R Corbishly, N Lowson, S Newbould,

**CO-OPTees:** Joy Fisher – Alliance Service Users and Carers  
Sally Morgan – Equality Issues

### 1) Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor A Hussain, Councillor D Coupar, Councillor Suzi Armitage and Simeon Perry.

### 2) Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly Cllr Les Carter, Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods and Housing and Cllr Peter Harrand Executive Board Member for Adult Health and Social Care.

### 3) Notes of Previous Meeting

Notes from the previous meeting were not available and will be circulated to all members of the Adaptations Working Group as soon as possible.

### 4) Performance Levels

4.1) The group was advised that there are some discrepancies in the adaptations performance 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter figures presented. The Management team were not in agreement with the accuracy of the report. Helen Freeman apologised for this and explained, along with Liz Ward and Colin Moss, the difficulties in extracting comparable data. ICT are currently trying to develop some software to resolve this problem. The AWG were assured that an accurate report would be available to the group on or before the 5<sup>th</sup> of January 2009.

4.2) Targets for assessment and recommendation time to by Adult Social Care and Children's services as follows:

Service User	Regulating Body	No of days for assessment	No of days for recommendation
New Adults	CSCI	28	28
Other Adults (current service users)	LCC Targets	90	28
Children	Ofsted	42	28 (LCC target)

Each case is then prioritised as low medium or high dependant on risk, which determines the target delivery times used by the Adaptations Agency or ALMO.

4.3) The group praised the fact that ALMO adaptations targets are less than for private adaptations and asked why this was the case. C Moss explained that there are additional factors within the private process that are not required for adaptations within ALMO properties, such as the grant application process. The group noted that the application process, including long and very involved means testing (a statutory requirement) can delay the delivery of an adaptation considerably. The group considered this to be unacceptable. Cllr S Andrew added that officers should investigate how operations could be reduced and time scales speeded up and concluded by pointing out that the ALMO's are easily achieving their target dates so these should be reviewed.

The group also noted that potentially one long and drawn out case can make the figures look artificially bad and that the method of reporting needs to identify such cases.

The group deemed the DCLG target date of 104 days for high risk cases as unacceptable. C Moss added that it is possible to speed up delivery however there are insufficient budgetary resources to support this. £6m of funding has been allocated for 2008/2009, to deliver the work required a further £1.9m of funding would be needed.

The group requested details of how much funding would be required to clear the total backlog of cases.

C. Moss also clarified that once an adaptation has been provided it effectively belongs to that person. They could take it with them if they move house, however in some cases, where a person moves, the Council would have to provide and fund that adaptation again.

4.4) Cllr JL Carter expressed his grave concern at the level of funding attributed to adaptations. He advised the group that funding in recent years has doubled but it is still not sufficient. It would be impossible for the Adaptations Agency to work any faster as there is not the funding to support the commissioned work.

With the conclusion of decency funding the ALMO's could soon find themselves in a similar funding situation.

The elderly suffer a large amount of falls in the homes and the Council need to be proactive in building safety features into the design of homes.

S. Morgan added that the Council seems to be fire fighting and it may be useful to conduct some analysis on the proportion of adaptations for older people. With demographic information relating to the levels of our aging population some proactive planning could be put into place.

4.5) The group asked if service users were advised as a matter of course of the target date for the delivery of their adaptation. C. Moss advised that this does not happen however if a recommendation was made by the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board it incorporate this into correspondence it would be simple to introduce.

4.6) The group enquired how the ALMO's/ agency achieved best value for money. C Moss advised the group that a VFM and procurement report is tabled for discussion at the next Adaptations Working Group meeting in January.

The group was advised that investment in adaptations has contributed to savings within the PCT's. The group resolved that it may be advantageous to invite the PCT to the next meeting to discuss a potential additional funding arrangement.

4.7) The group requested further information as detailed in section 6

## **5) Adaptations Framework**

5.1) M Askham advised the group of the background leading up to the development of the Adaptations Framework. The scope of the framework is to ensure that customers receive a consistent service irrespective of the ALMO/agency delivering it. Development of the framework has been overseen by the Adaptations Operations Group which is chaired by H Freeman

5.2) The group asked what progress has been made relating to the suggested appointment of a Complex Case Coordinator. M Askham and H Freeman advised that the ALMO Chief Executives had met and were concerned that the creation of this post may not provide value for money. The group agreed that further contact with the Chief Executives may be necessary to understand in their decision.

5.3) Cllr Chapman requested that a complex case report be brought to the group/board every 3 months.

## **6) Next Steps**

6.1) Procurement will be the item for discussion at the next meeting

6.2) Further information requested by the Group to be provided for the 12<sup>th</sup> of January 2009 meeting.

- **Value For Money & Procurement.**

- i) The costs of the various installations
- ii) Opportunities to scale-up work (for efficiencies) by for example installing mixer taps as standard in public sector.

- iii) Information on economies of scale in other areas. Increased purchasing power with contractors who may be inclined to hike up costs when a grant is known to be involved.
- iv) Information on the quality checks and contract monitoring arrangements are in place to ensure a good quality service is provided to both the Council and the service user.

- **Performance**

- i) An accurate performance report in advance of the next meeting – report deadline is the 5<sup>th</sup> January 2008.
- ii) Info on the performance of the various stages of service delivery, as well as the overall LCC performance.
- iii) Details of the exceptional cases (i.e. much longer than the target) & reasons why, e.g. an extension, protracted means assessment.
- iv) Details of the reduction in ALMO targets?
- v) What is the future capital investment required in the private & public sector, to address known & anticipated demand and what level of investment would be required to clear the backlog for private work and in the ALMO's.
- vi) What is the saving to the NHS as a result of adaptations? Also is the Council liable for any costs or recharges to the PCT's where a person has to remain in hospital as a result of adaptations not being undertaken within target dates. If so how much as this been for 2007/8 and 2008/9 (so far).

- **Adaptations Framework**

A copy of the minutes of the meeting where the ALMO Chief Execs discussed the suggested post for a Complex Casework Coordinator. (should they exist.) If no minutes exist the Directors of the ALMO's will be asked individually in writing.

- **Other Information**

- i) Info on the contributions made by applicants to their adaptations.
- ii) What bureaucracy is involved due to statutory procedures and national guidelines that would help if it were removed?
- iii) The proportion of adaptations required to address acute needs as oppose to chronic needs (to give some idea of how much of future need could be planned, knowing that we have an aging population)?
- iv) If possible, how many people buy their own adaptations (whether public or private sector residents)?
- v) Feedback information on the complex case management every 3 months.

6.3) Further information requested by the Group to be provided in preparation for the 12<sup>th</sup> of February 2009 meeting.

- **Customer Satisfaction**

i) Data relating to registered Compliments and Complaints received in the last 6 months and the nature of the compliment/complaint

ii) Examples of adaptation cases, 3 from each of the ALMO's and 3 private, to look at , the selection should include a case that has not been dealt with particularly well, one dealt with efficiently and one mid range.

**7) Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Monday 12<sup>th</sup> January 2008 at 10.00 a.m.

Additional Meeting Scheduled for Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> of February @ 9:30am

Draft