

# Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

## Scrutiny Board Inquiry: Personalisation

Working Group Meeting: 10<sup>th</sup> December 2009

Present **Members**

Cllr Judith Chapman – Chair (JC)  
Cllr Vonnie Morgan (VM)  
Joy Fisher (co-opted member) (JF)  
Sally Morgan (co-opted member) (SM)

**Officers**

John Lennon – Chief Officer, Access and Inclusion (JL)  
Richard Graham – Senior Quality Assurance Officer (RG)  
Emma Lewis – Business Change Manager (EL)  
Alex Firth – Principal Audit Manager (AF)  
Jason Brook – Audit Manager (JB)  
Sandra Newbould – Principal Scrutiny Advisor (SN)

Apologies Cllr Penny Ewens

No.	Item	Action
1	<b>Attendance</b> The attendance and apologies as above were noted. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2	<b>Notes of Previous Meeting</b> The draft notes of the meeting were presented and agreed.	
3	<b>Risk Management Framework and Safeguarding</b> A report and the draft copy of the Risk Policy 2009 were presented to the meeting by RG who explained that an element of risk is inevitable but this has to be reduced to an acceptable level. The risk policy is a working document which is being updated. The most up to date version will be circulated to members of the working group.  Questions arising:  JC – If risk occurs what is the contingency to deal with it and how will it be resolved? When will the risk policy be communicated to staff and what is the timescale for training? What steps are taken where it becomes apparent that there is a safeguarding issue or that the individual is taking unacceptable risk outside the agreed plan? VM – Problems must be being identified now from the pilot, are we learning from these? JF – Stated that institutionalised care should be seen as a failure to provide a service that meets the needs of the individual and also asked if companies are risk averse due to insurance liabilities. SM – How do we deal with commissioned services whose risk policies are different, would we try and standardise these to mirror Leeds City Council's?	SN

	<p>The group was advised that a full risk assessment is undertaken when the individual's needs are assessed. This can then be monitored to ensure that everything is operating within the known boundaries of risk and to ensure that the correct decisions have been made. If problems are identified then an assessment review is undertaken. A common sense approach is undertaken when judging risk in every day arrangements. What needs to be managed is accountability for risk management to ensure that front line staff feel confident to make judgements and remain accountable for decisions made without the need for escalation to management.</p> <p>Where any disagreements arise between service user and service provider the matter is escalated through various tiers of management to head of service and eventually the Ombudsman. The working group felt that this process should be better dealt with in a formal and time constrained manner by the Council to avoid escalation to the Ombudsman and that a time specified process similar to the complaints procedure should be introduced so that progress can be monitored and that service users have an idea of how long resolution is expected to take. JF advised that she felt the public would welcome a standardised process.</p> <p>Formal training will be delivered after April, JC added that risk assessment training for elected members and co-optees would also be useful. SN to liaise with Member Development.</p> <p>With regard to the risk policies of other companies, the legal position is that we have to respect others risk management policies, however if we are commissioning the organisation then there is leverage. If a risk assessment is not done then the company would be negligent.</p> <p>If an assessment is done thoroughly and risks are picked up then potential safeguarding issues should also be identified. There is very little risk data available from other authorities to assist but there is a regional forum where agreement has been reached to assist each other with personalisation information.</p>	SN
4	<p><b>Early Implementer Evaluation and Action Plan</b></p> <p>A copy of the phase 1 early implementer evaluation report was presented to the working group. The evaluation team providing input the report consisted of Audit, Sandra O'Donovan (customer of pilot and consultant) and Viv Slater (In Control and consultant).</p> <p>Five significant high priority areas caused concern to the group particularly around budgets and financial management (recommendations 5,6,7,8 and 11). As phase 2 of the evaluation due to be completed in January and considering concerns of the group regarding reported concerns the group requested that a further update be brought before the full Scrutiny Board in March 2010.</p>	SN/EL

	<p>Questions arising:</p> <p>JC – Stated that the department should consider the fact that those with complex needs may show a preference for SDS and the sample in the pilot may be more reflective than anticipated. The group expressed overall concern at the £50k overspend when only 21 support plans are in place although it was explained that this was due to 3 particularly complex cases. Was there any indication of affordability for SDS when the pilot started? Will budget problems delay going live? Are we still due to meet government targets?  SM – What happens if funding runs out? Does this mean everyone will get less or will SDS stop? SM stated that a good cross section chosen for the pilot and added her concern that budget pressures may cause quality and quantity issues.  VM – Have budget implications been reported back to Government Office?</p> <p>The working group were advised that an action plan has been put in place to rectify and remove some of the concerns raised from the evaluation, including the budget and financial planning concerns. At the commencement of the project there was very little information and guidance relating to the financial impact of SDS so forecasting was mainly a desktop exercise with an extra 20% contingency. If it is apparent that there is an affordability gap choice at any price is not an option. With regard to Government Office, the local authority has targets which have to be met and is being held accountable, if problems are encountered then local solutions have to be found. Feedback however is reported regularly to the CQC. Any anticipated budget problems will not delay the go live date and government targets are on track to be met.</p>	
5	<p><b>Further Action</b>  Scheduled session of the working group are now concluded, further sessions could be scheduled subject to the resolution of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board. Scheduled session for the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board 13<sup>th</sup> January 2010 is the 'Transitional Arrangements for Children into Adult Social Care' inquiry part of which will cover SDS arrangements and may present further evidence for this inquiry.</p>	
6	<p><b>Future Meeting Dates</b>  Working Group only to discuss potential recommendations – potentially 5<sup>th</sup> of January am.</p>	SN