

Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

Scrutiny Board Inquiry: Domiciliary and Reablement Service Working Group

Working Group Meeting: 28th September 2010

Present **Members**

Cllr Judith Chapman – Chair (JC)
Cllr Brian Cleasby (BC)
Cllr Sharon Hamilton (SH)
Joy Fisher (co-opted member) (JF)

Officers

Dennis Holmes – Deputy Director Strategic Commissioning (DH)
John Lennon – Chief Officer, Access and Inclusion (JL)
Emma Lewis – Programme Manager Service Transformation (EL)
Sandra Newbould – Principal Scrutiny Advisor (SN)

Apologies Cllr Ted Hanley
Cllr Valerie Kendall

| No. | Item | Action |
|-----|--|--------|
| 1 | Attendance The attendance and apologies as above were noted. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. | |
| 2 | Matters Arising None | |
| 3 | Background and Aspirations, Demand and Value for Money DH provided a summary of the report provided to the working group and advised the group that the homecare service has been evolving since 2005. Developments in direct payments, personalisation and other external influences have impacted on the implementation of the model and the direction of change. Success has been achieved however in commissioning a number of private contractors. Other authorities have made significant homecare service changes and Leeds is behind by comparison in the balance between internal and external provided services. Other authorities have already reshaped their services. LCC however has the benefit of neighbourhood networks. Questions Arising and Views Expressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Statistics based on demographic change. What about other factors and influences which may impact due to changes in services?• Do we have a strategy for dealing with the potential increase in uptake? | |

- Cost differential between private and in house provider. Concern was expressed that those with personal budgets would not opt for the in house service due the price differential.
- Clarification of additional estimated budget pressure of £2m in 2013.
- 2009/10 Budget pressures due to using the Independent Sector providers instead of in house provision
- An explanation of the difference in service hours provided across the City. The South East seems to receive a significant amount.
- Clarification of feedback figures in para 3.7 54 service users out of a potential of 5648 is a low rate of return. No data provided regarding the compliments and complaints received from stakeholders.
- Job satisfaction and motivation of Council staff providing domiciliary care.

In response the group were advised that projection and forecast of the net rise of home care service users is based on population projections. Changes in the provision of traditional based services will have an impact however this should also enable of re-provision of budget to facilitate this impact.

A report is due to be presented to Executive Board which will outline a potential strategy for future service delivery.

Reducing the cost differential between the Council and independent sector would be very difficult due to a number of factors, such as staff terms and conditions and lack of flexibility in the in-house service.

The option of placing individuals with independent sector companies was put into place during 2009/10 even though there were considerable budget pressures. This was due to problems with absenteeism in house.

Service hours provided show a concentration in the super output areas. The maps provided do not show privately commissioned services. The independent sector provide a service in other parts of the city.

Feedback provided was in response to 200 people surveyed. The working group requested data about the number and types of complaints and compliments received about the in house provision.

The provision of future services will be based more on the needs of individuals. This will include the development of a Reablement service. It is hoped that staff involvement in this service will be a

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| | <p>motivator and create job satisfaction.</p> <p>Based on personal experience JF stated that the in house provision was of a higher standard than that of the independent sector. DH advised the group however that work has been undertaken in the independent sector to improve structures and service, and feedback received from service users reported very little difference between the in house provision and the independent sector in terms of quality.</p> <p>BC stipulated that the Local Authority should focus on providing specialist care as there is adequate private sector provision for general homecare.</p> | |
| 4 | <p>Next Steps</p> <p>Reablement - Early Implementer project, Assessment, Eligibility Criteria and Charging</p> | |
| 5 | <p>Further Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparative data with other core cities – Figure 4 • Sickness absence levels within the Independent Sector • Compliments and complaints data on the in-house provision. 2008/9 – current. • Service user survey – copy requested and details regarding how this information was provided. (requested after the conclusion of the meeting by BC.) | DH/JL |
| 6 | <p>Next Meeting Date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th October 2010 - 13:30 until 15:30. Committee Room 3 | |