



SCRUTINY BOARD (ADULT SOCIAL CARE)

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds on
Wednesday, 23rd June, 2010 at 10.00 am

(A pre-meeting will take place for ALL Members of the Board at 9.30 a.m.)

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

J Chapman	-	Weetwood;
B Cleasby	-	Horsforth;
P Davey	-	City and Hunslet;
A Gabriel	-	Beeston and Holbeck;
S Hamilton	-	Moortown;
T Hanley (Chair)	-	Bramley and Stanningley;
A Hussain	-	Gipton and Harehills;
V Kendall	-	Roundhay;
R Pryke	-	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill;
K Renshaw	-	Ardsley and Robin Hood;
D Schofield	-	Temple Newsam;
S Varley	-	Morley South;

Please note: Certain or all items on this agenda may be recorded on tape

Agenda compiled by:
Andy Booth
Governance Services
Civic Hall
LEEDS LS1 1UR
Tel: 24 74325

Principal Scrutiny Advisor:
Sandra Newbould
Tel: 24 74792

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25* of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded.)</p> <p>(* In accordance with Procedure Rule 25, notice of an appeal must be received in writing by the Chief Democratic Services Officer at least 24 hours before the meeting.)</p>	
2			<p>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:-</p>	

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
3			<p>LATE ITEMS</p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration.</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes.)</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>To declare any personal / prejudicial interests for the purpose of Section 81 (3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct.</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>To receive any apologies for absence.</p>	
6			<p>MINUTES - 11 MAY 2010</p> <p>To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2010</p>	1 - 4
7			<p>CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION IN RELATION TO SCRUTINY</p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Development.</p>	5 - 6
8			<p>CO-OPTED MEMBERS</p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p>	7 - 12
9			<p>INPUT TO THE WORK PROGRAMME 2010/11 - SOURCES OF WORK AND ESTABLISHING THE BOARD'S PRIORITIES</p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p>	13 - 30

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
10			<p>DETERMINING THE BOARD'S WORK PROGRAMME 2010/11</p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p>	31 - 46
11			<p>INQUIRY REPORT, SELF DIRECTED SUPPORT AND PERSONAL BUDGETS- FORMAL RESPONSE</p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development</p>	47 - 74
12			<p>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>Monday, 19 July 2010 at 10.00 a.m. (Pre-meeting for all Board Members at 9.30 a.m.)</p>	

Agenda Item 6

SCRUTINY BOARD (ADULT SOCIAL CARE)

TUESDAY, 11TH MAY, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor J Chapman in the Chair

Councillors B Chastney, P Ewens,
Mrs R Feldman, C Fox, V Morgan and
E Taylor

C0-OPTEES J Fisher and S Morgan

106 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the final meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) for the 2010/11 Municipal Year and expressed her thanks to all Board Members for their support and hard work during the year.

Congratulations were made to officers in Adult Social Care as the Social Care Institute of Excellence had acknowledged their Dignity in Care Campaign as an example of good practice.

107 Declarations of Interest

The following personal declarations of interest were made:

- Councillor J Chapman as she has a family member employed in a local care capacity (Agenda Item 9) (Minute No 113 refers)
- Councillor P Ewens in her capacity as a Member of the Cardigan Centre (Agenda Item 9) (Minute No 113 refers)
- Councillor E Taylor due to her employment with NHS Leeds (Agenda Item 9) (Minute No 113 refers)
- J Fisher in her capacity as a service user and voluntary sector representative (Agenda Item 9) (Minute No 113 refers)
- S Morgan in her capacity as a service user (Agenda Item 9) (Minute No 113 refers)

108 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Andrew, Gabriel and Hanley.

109 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2010 be confirmed as a correct record.

110 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Draft minutes to be approved at the next meeting

Minute No 100 – Adult Social Care Commissioning Update

The Chair welcomed Dennis Holmes, Deputy Director - Adult Social Services to the meeting. The Board was given an update on the position with the review of commissioning for Neighbourhood Networks. The Board was informed that it was intended to present an updated report to the Executive Board in July 2010. Contracts for the current Neighbourhood Networks have been extended for 3 months until July in the first instance and, if required, then for a further three months until October 2010 and it would be ensured that all 99 Elected Members would be kept appraised across the City.

(Councillor Fox joined the meeting at 10.10 a.m. during the discussion on this item).

111 Inquiry into Transitional Arrangements for Disabled Young People into Adult Social Care

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development referred to the Board's recent Inquiry into Transitional Arrangements for Disabled Young People into Adult Social Care and a copy of the final draft scrutiny inquiry report was included with the agenda.

It was reported that the draft report had been circulated to relevant officers and the Executive Member for Adult Health and Social Care who had all accepted the recommendations within.

RESOLVED – That the inquiry report on Transitional Arrangements for Disabled Young People into Adult Social Care be agreed.

112 Statement on the Independence Wellbeing and Choice Action Plan

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development referred to the Independence, Wellbeing and Choice Report and subsequent Action Plan that had been monitored by the Board's Proposals Working Group. A draft statement had been included in the report which outlined the findings and recommendations of the Proposals Working Group.

Dennis Holmes addressed the Board. He reported that there was no longer a requirement for intensive oversight of safeguarding in the City and that in terms of monitoring from the Care Quality Commission (CQC), this would now proceed in the standard way for an authority with a good rating. Future aspirations included achieving excellent status.

Improvements in standards had been achieved ahead of schedule and congratulations were made to all concerned.

RESOLVED – That the statement on the monitoring of the Independence Wellbeing and Choice Action Plan be approved.

113 Annual Report

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development contained the Board's proposed submission to the Annual Scrutiny Report to Council.

Members discussed the report and requested that the future scrutiny of Homecare Provision be included for the Board's work programme.

The Chair expressed thanks to all that had been involved in the scrutiny process for their support and hard work.

RESOLVED – That paragraph 3.2 of the report be noted and the Board's contribution to the composite Annual Report be approved.

114 Work Programme

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development summarised the Board's Work Programme and also included the latest Forward Plan of Key Decisions and Executive Board Minutes.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: S Newbould

Tel: 2474792

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: SCRUTINY BOARD (Adult Social Care)

Date: 23rd June 2010

Subject: Changes to the Council's Constitution in relation to Scrutiny.

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report provides the Board with information on recent amendments to the Council's Constitution, as agreed by Council on 28th May 2010, which directly relate to and/or impact on the work of Scrutiny Boards.

2.0 Background

2.1 The annual review of Scrutiny more often than not identifies a number of areas for amendment within Article 6 of the Constitution, the Scrutiny Boards' Terms of Reference and the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules. These are either to ensure consistency in wording, to reflect legislative changes or to provide procedural clarity.

2.2 The more significant amendments agreed by Council were;

Article 6

- Additional bullet point to clarify that value for money reviews on particular services, functions or issues relating to their area of responsibility may be undertaken by Scrutiny Boards.
- Amendment to reflect the designation and duties of the Council's Scrutiny Officer .
- Amendment to the power to co-opt onto the Crime and Disorder Committee, following recent amendments to legislation,

Scrutiny Board Terms of Reference

- That there are six Scrutiny Boards achieved by the deletion of Scrutiny Board (City and Regional Partnerships). These functions will be taken up by all Boards with the lead for City Region and Leeds Initiative resting with Scrutiny Board (Central and Corporate Functions)
- Additional bullet point to clarify that value for money reviews on particular services, functions or issues relating to their area of responsibility may be undertaken by Scrutiny Boards.

Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules

- Minor amendments and re-ordering of paragraphs to make distinction between reviews and other items of work which may result in reports and recommendations and full Scrutiny Inquiries which involve formal terms of reference, the use of the Inquiry selection criteria and formal discussion with the relevant Executive Board Member.
- Inclusion of specific reference to “Partner Authorities”, including new powers for Scrutiny Boards to require information, reflecting legislation.¹ .
- Clarification that should a Member withdraw their signature from a Call In and no further signatures are obtained within the required time period, the Call In will fall.
- That substitutions are permitted for all Scrutiny Boards. Substitutes are to be drawn from the pool of Scrutiny Board Members

3.0 Recommendations

- 3.1 In fulfilling the role and function of the Scrutiny Board, Members are requested to note the amendments to the Council’s Constitution outlined in this report.

Background Papers

The Council’s Constitution

¹ Local Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees)(England) Regulations 2009.

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: SCRUTINY BOARD (Adult Social Care)

Date: 23rd June 2010

Subject: Co-opted Members

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of the report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek the Scrutiny Board's formal consideration for the appointment of co-opted members to the Board.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 For a number of years the Council's Constitution has made provision for the appointment of co-opted members to individual Scrutiny Boards. For those Scrutiny Boards where co-opted members have previously been appointed, such arrangements have tended to be reviewed on an annual basis, usually at the beginning of a new municipal year. However, the appointment of co-opted members has not been considered consistently across all Scrutiny Boards.

Leeds City Council Scrutiny Review (May 2009)

- 2.2 As part of their 2008/09 Audit and Inspection Plan, KPMG (the Council's external auditors) carried out a review of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function. An aspect of their report related to the appointment of co-opted members to Scrutiny Boards.
- 2.3 The relevant extract and associated recommendation from the KPMG report is detailed below:

Having attended Scrutiny meetings at LCC that had both co-opted Members on the Board and no co-opted Members there appeared to be a greater level of participation by all when the Boards contained co-opted Members. In addition the contribution made by the co-opted Members was very valuable as these Members were able to draw upon their experiences and provide a different perspective.

Currently the constitution of LCC does allow all Scrutiny Boards to have co-opted members it is just something that is not widely exercised. This is almost the opposite at Bristol City Council where there are a large number of Scrutiny Boards with co-opted Members. The Scrutiny Support Unit has however been proactive in this area and have recently taken a paper to the Scrutiny Advisory Group highlighting the benefits of having co-opted Members on Scrutiny Boards.

Recommendation Six

Each of the Scrutiny Boards should assess more formally whether co-opted Members should be invited to participate in their Board so to allow them to draw from the benefits of their involvement.

- 2.4 In response to this recommendation, it was agreed that each Scrutiny Board would be formally asked to consider the potential involvement of co-opted members throughout the year.

3.0 Arrangements for appointing co-opted members

General arrangements

- 3.1 It is widely recognised that in some circumstances, in particular where there is some specialist knowledge or skill, co-opted members can significantly aid the work Scrutiny Boards. This is currently reflected in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards) of the Council's Constitution, which outlines the options available to Scrutiny Boards in relation to appointing co-opted members. In general terms, Scrutiny Boards can appoint:
- Up to five non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council ; and/or,
 - Up to two non-voting co-opted members for a term of office that relates to the duration of a particular and specific scrutiny inquiry.

Specific arrangements

- 3.2 In the majority of cases the appointment of co-opted members is optional and is determined by the relevant Scrutiny Board, however, there are some particular legislative exceptions. Such cases are also set out in Article 6 (Scrutiny Boards) of the Council's Constitution and summarised below:

Education Representatives

- 3.3 In addition to elected Members appointed by Council, the Local Government Act 2000 states that the relevant Scrutiny Board dealing with education matters shall include in its membership the following voting representatives in accordance with statutory requirements:
- One Church of England diocese representative¹
 - One Roman Catholic diocese representative¹
 - Three parent governor representatives²

Where the Scrutiny Board deals with other non-educational matters the co-opted members may participate in any discussion but shall not be entitled to vote on those matters.

¹ Article 6 states this appointment shall be for a term of office that does not go beyond the next Annual Meeting of Council

² Article 6 states these appointments shall be for a four-year term of office

Crime and Disorder Committee

- 3.4 In accordance with the requirements of the Police and Justice Act 2006, the Council has designated the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) to act as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.5 In its capacity as a crime and disorder committee, the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) may co-opt additional members to serve on the Board, providing they are not an Executive Member
- 3.6 The Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) may limit the co-opted member's participation to those matters where the Scrutiny Board is acting as the Council's crime and disorder committee.
- 3.7 Unless the Scrutiny Board (Environment and Neighbourhoods) decides otherwise, any co-opted member shall not be entitled to vote and the Board may withdraw the co-opted membership at any time.

4.0 Issue to consider when seeking to appoint co-opted members

- 4.1 Currently, there is no overarching national guidance or criteria that should be considered when seeking to appoint co-opted members. As a result, there is a plethora of methods employed within Councils for the appointment of co-optees to Overview and Scrutiny Committees (Scrutiny Boards). For example, some Councils use "job descriptions", some carry out formal interviews and some advertise for co-optees in the local press, with individuals completing a simple application form which is then considered by Members.
- 4.2 In considering or seeking the appointment of co-opted members, Scrutiny Boards may find it useful to consider that co-opted members should:
- Add value to the work of the Scrutiny Board and/or specific inquiry, by having some specialist skill or knowledge
 - Be considered as representatives of wider groups of people. For example, service user representatives, voluntary or community groups etc.
 - Not be seen as a replacement to professional advice from officers;
 - Be mindful about the extent of any potential conflicts of interest;
- 4.3 Despite the lack of any national guidance, what is clear is that any process for appointing co-opted members should be open, effective and carried out in a manner which seeks to strengthen the work of Scrutiny Boards.
- 4.4 In addition, when considering the issue of co-opted members, Scrutiny Boards should also be mindful of the role of expert witnesses and seeking information / evidence from a variety of different sources to help fulfill the objectives of the work programme and/or a specific inquiry.

5.0 Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

- 5.1 During 2009/10, Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) made the following non-voting co-opted appointments:
- A representative of the Alliance Service Users and Carers – Ms Joy Fisher
 - A representative of Equality Issues – Mrs Sally Morgan

- 5.2 The nominating bodies have indicated that they would wish the same people to continue on the Board, should the Scrutiny Board decide to maintain the same range of co-opted appointments for 2009/10.

Leeds Local Involvement Networks (LINK)

- 5.3 The Scrutiny Board is advised to consider the role of the new Leeds Local Involvement Network (LINK). In summary, the LINK acts as the successor to the Patient and Public Involvement Forums, but with an extended remit covering social care. Run by local people and groups, the role of a LINK is to promote involvement; to find out what people like and dislike about local services; monitor the care provided by services; and use LINK powers to hold services to account.
- 5.4 Under provisions in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, the local LINK has the right to refer both health and social care matters to the relevant Scrutiny Board. In turn, this places responsibility on the appropriate Scrutiny Board to acknowledge any such referrals and keep the LINK informed about what actions, if any, will be taken.
- 5.5 Locally, in August 2008, the Shaw Trust was appointed as the host organisation to support the work of the Leeds LINK. Since that time it has been working with the LINK Preparatory Group to get a wide range of people and organisations involved in the LINK. In addition, a Steering Group was established to act as a decision-making body and formal steering group.

Leeds LINK – Annual Report

- 5.6 LINKs are accountable to the public and to the Secretary of State for Health. As such, every year all LINKs are required to publish an annual report, which will also be sent to the Care Quality Commission, to relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committees (Scrutiny Boards), Primary Care Trusts (NHS Leeds) and the Strategic Health Authority (NHS Yorkshire and the Humber).
- 5.7 The Annual Report (2009/10) for the Leeds LINK, covering the period 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010, is currently being prepared and will be agreed by the Steering Group. The deadline for the completion of the Annual Report (2009/10) is 30 June 2010 and, in line with the requirements of legislation, will be made available to the Scrutiny Board as soon as practicable.

Leeds LINK representatives as co-opted members

- 5.8 Given the role and function of LINKs, the relationship between the Leeds LINK and the Council's Scrutiny Boards will be key. The Board may therefore wish to give consideration to seeking nominations from Leeds LINK for representatives to act as non-voting co-opted members on the Board this year.
- 5.9 The Board may also wish to consider a similar approach if/when seeking to identify any non-voting co-opted members for the duration of a particular and specific scrutiny inquiry (as indicated in paragraph 3.1 above).

6.0 Recommendation

- 5.1 In line with the options available outlined in this report, Members are asked to consider the appointment of co-opted members to the Scrutiny Board.

6.0 Background Papers

- The Council's Constitution

- Police and Justice Act 2006
- KPMG Scrutiny Review May 2009

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: Adult Social Care

Date: 23rd June 2010

**Subject: Input to the Work Programme 2010/11 - Sources of Work and
Establishing the Board's Priorities**

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 This report provides information and guidance to assist the Board develop its work programme for 2010/11.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 Relevant information from the following key sources have been extracted appropriate to this Board's responsibilities and attached to this paper to assist Members in this process (Appendix 1):

- Council Business Plan 2008 – 2011 – Executive Summary
- List of work undertaken in the past six years.
- The relevant extract from the latest forward plan
- Relevant suggestions contained in the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Boards Annual Report.
- Relevant suggestions contained in Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board Reports and Statements.

2.2 Other sources of work will continue to be 'requests for scrutiny' and corporate referrals.

2.3 The Board will receive quarterly performance information. This information may identify further areas for Scrutiny.

3.0 Work programming

- 3.1 The Executive Board Member and appropriate officers have been invited to attend this meeting to contribute to discussions about the Board's work programme.
- 3.2 Following these discussions, the Board is asked to agree an outline work programme that prioritises the issues to be investigated.

4.0 Guidance

- 4.1 Over the last few years of Scrutiny Board work, experience has shown that the process is more effective and adds greater value if the Board seeks to minimise the number of substantial inquiries running at one time and focus its resources on one key issue at a time. This view was echoed within the findings of the KPMG external audit report on the Scrutiny function in Leeds
- 4.2 The Board is advised to consider the benefits of single item agendas (excluding miscellaneous information and minutes) in order to focus on all the relevant evidence and complete an inquiry in a shorter period of time. There are various mechanisms available to assist the Board in concluding inquiries quickly, such as working groups and site visits.
- 4.3 The agreed Memorandum of Understanding between Executive Board and Overview and Scrutiny which sits within the Council's Constitution states;

"The responsibility of those setting scrutiny work programmes is, therefore, to ensure that items of work come from a strategic approach as well as a need to challenge service performance and respond to issues of high public interest.

It is recognised that Scrutiny Boards have a 'watching brief' role. In addition information is required for members' own development process, particularly as membership of the Boards is changed annually.

However, it is also recognised that agendas are often filled up with reports for this purpose, which takes up time for both officers and Members. Where Scrutiny Boards wish to ask questions at a general or more strategic level and/or be updated on issues already considered in detail, the facility of Members' Questions – where a verbal exchange replaces written reports - should be used.

It is expected that where ever possible prior notification is given of the likely questions to be asked".

- 4.4 For the past couple of years the Children's Services Board in particular has developed the approach of devoting one meeting per quarter to 'horizon scan' issues and consider performance management. This includes discussing with Executive Members and officers relevant issues. This is acknowledged within the KPMG report as good practice.

5.0 Recommendations

- 5.1 Members are requested to use the attached information and the discussion with those present at the meeting to develop its work programme.

Background Papers

Council Business Plan 2008 - 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Council Business Plan 2008 to 2011

Executive Summary

About the Council Business Plan

The **Council Business Plan 2008 to 2011** is an important high level plan which outlines the ways we want to change and improve our organisation over the next three years. It sets out the internally facing business development, organisational change and process transformation activities that we will be undertaking and it ensures that we have the resources in place to deliver these.

It is the sister document to the **Leeds Strategic Plan 2008 to 11** which sets out our externally facing priorities for improving the lives of the people of Leeds. These priorities are not just for the council but are shared with our partners across the city. By changing the way we work through the Council Business Plan we will be in good shape to successfully deliver the Leeds Strategic Plan. In other words the Business Plan is the **smarter working** that helps us achieve the **better results** of the Leeds Strategic Plan.

Our ambitions within the business plan are structured around three strategic outcomes which are translated into actions through a more detailed set of improvement priorities. These are supported by performance indicators and targets to measure the progress we will make over the next three years. There are also three big ideas which bring together the key themes of the plan and provide a focus for our efforts. These outcomes and improvement priorities are shown on the following pages.

Delivering the Plan

The Council Business Plan is translated into action through annual service plans, team plans and individuals actions and activities across the whole organisation. Everyone has a part to play in fulfilling these ambitions and they can only be achieved by working together. Many of the improvements in the plan do not work on their own and are linked together. For example, to improve leadership we need to make sure our leaders have good skills, are fully trained, are given feedback, and have clear policies to support them. The Business Plan will help us to co-ordinate these changes effectively.

Senior officers from across the council have responsibility for co-ordinating and delivering the improvement priorities and we have arrangements in place to monitor our progress on a regular basis and at the highest level.

Further information

For further information about the Council Business Plan 2008 to 2011 please contact:

councilplan@leeds.gov.uk
0113 224 3462

Or visit the intranet pages of the Policy Performance and Improvement team.

Business Outcome 1

We are a values led organisation and our people are motivated and empowered

BIG IDEA

We will take significant steps to reduce our carbon emissions

By 2011 we want to:

Organisational Design and Workforce Planning

- Ensure we have the right staff, in the right place with the right skills at the right time
- Empower, support and develop our staff and members by embedding core skills and behaviours with performance based appraisals
- Improve understanding and transparency of our decision-making and accountability processes

Leadership

- Improve leadership at all levels including officers and elected members
- Enhance our leadership of the city
- Strengthen communication (skills and mechanisms) at all levels

Democratic engagement

- Strengthen our democratic processes to improve governance and policy making
- Maximise member involvement in policy development, decision making and accountability

Equality Diversity and Cohesion and Integration

- Ensure colleagues reflect the diversity of our communities at all levels
- Ensure fair access to all our services
- Embed equality and diversity throughout the organisation

Sustainability

- Reduce the carbon emissions arising from our buildings, vehicles and operations **BIG IDEA**
- Increase the proportion of socially responsible goods and services that we procure
- Support the achievement of our strategic outcomes through our corporate social responsibility programme

Business Outcome 2
We are an intelligent organisation, using good quality information to deliver better outcomes

BIG IDEA
We will have a one council understanding of our customers

By 2011 we want to:

Information and knowledge management

- Improve our systems and processes to enable us to use our information effectively and efficiently
- Use our information to shape service provision, provide constructive challenge and improve our decision making at all levels
- Ensure we have the right intelligence to inform our strategic planning
- Develop arrangements to protect and share information in line with legislative and regulatory requirements

Customer involvement, choice and satisfaction

- Improve our understanding of our customers
- Increase choice so customers can access services in more convenient ways
- Improve our services based on customer feedback
- Manage customer expectation and deliver on our promises
- Develop joined up and person centred services designed around the needs of our customers
- Enhance the links between front and back office services to deliver excellent end-to-end services

Stakeholder Engagement

- Increase involvement, engagement and participation of all communities especially under-represented groups
- Build trust with local communities to encourage greater engagement

Business Outcome 3
Our resources are clearly prioritised to provide excellent services and value for money

BIG IDEA
We will explore opportunities for collaboration to support our business transformation aspirations

By 2011 we want to:

Resource Prioritisation

- Deliver our 5 year financial strategy to align resources to our strategic priorities
- Embed sustainability in our resource management processes
- Consider all additional sources of funding available to support our priorities

Efficiency/Value for Money

- Improve the efficiency of our services including maximising savings delivered through procurement, ICT and asset management.
- Embed value for money at all levels

Commissioning

- Implement a commissioning approach which is based on need, delivers value for money and ensures the best provider.

Service Improvement and Transformation

- Ensure strategic business transformation/improvement activity is prioritised and co-ordinated
- Enhance service improvement capacity to support business change at directorate/service level
- Embed a consistent approach to service planning which clearly links workforce planning, risk, financial and performance management.
- Explore opportunities for collaboration with private and public sector bodies BIG IDEA

Partnerships

- Develop sustainable and effective partnership governance framework

Support services

- Improve quality and efficiency of support services

List of Scrutiny inquiries undertaken in the past five years that are relevant to the Adult Social Care portfolio

YEAR	SCRUTINY BOARD	TITLE OF REPORT
In progress	Adult Social Care	Supporting Working Age Adults with Severe and Enduring Mental Health Problems
May 10	Adult Social Care	Transitional Arrangements for Children into Adult Social Care
May 10	Adult Social Care	Independence Wellbeing and Choice Action Plan
March 10	Adult Social Care	Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets
June 09	Adult Social Care	Major Adaptations for Disabled People
March 09	Adult Social Care	Dignity in Care - Statement
May 08	Health and Adult Social Care	Localisation of Health and Social Care Services
July 07	Health and Adult Social Care	Community Development in Health and Wellbeing
May 07	Health and Adult Social Care	Dignity in Care for Older People
April 06	Health and Wellbeing	Adult Day Services Review
April 06	Health and Wellbeing	Older People's Mental Health Services
May 05	Social Care	Social Services Transport Arrangements
May 05	Social Care	Recruitment and Retention of Staff
May 05	Social Care	Delayed Hospital Discharges

This page is intentionally left blank



FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

1 June 2010 – 30 September 2010

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

For the period 1 June 2010 to 30 September 2010

Key Decisions	Decision Maker	Expected Date of Decision	Proposed Consultation	Documents to be Considered by Decision Maker	Lead Officer (To whom representations should be made and email address to send representations to)
To award a contract to Methodist Homes Request to waive contract procedure rule 13 in respect of the Moor Allerton Extra Care Housing Scheme (Yew Tree Court) and Dementia Day Care Scheme (Bay Tree Resource Centre)	Director of Adult Social Services	1/6/10	Legal and Procurement	Report to the DASS	Director of Adult Social Services dennis.holmes@leeds.gov.uk

Neighbourhood Network Services - Extension to existing contracts Approval to extend existing contracts to Neighbourhood Network Services for a further three months to 1 st October 2010	Director of Adult Social Services	10/6/10	Adult Commissioning Board and NNS Project Board	Waiver Report	Director of Adult Social Services susan.gamblen@leeds.gov.uk
Social Care Systems Review Programme Capital Programme funding is required to support the implementation of a change programme including the procurement and implementation of a new Information Management System across Children and Young People's Social and Adult Social Care	Executive Board (Portfolio: Adult Health and Social Care)	16/6/10	Prior to June 2010 Executive Board, consultation will be performed with Adult Social Care DMT, Children and Young Peoples SLT, Social Care Services Board and the Corporate Leadership Team and Lead Members	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Adult Social Services stephen.hume@leeds.gov.uk
Holt Park Wellbeing Centre - Approval to submit the Final Business Case to Department of Health and Execution of the Contract for the Holt Park Well Being Centre	Executive Board (Portfolio: Adult Health and Social Care)	16/6/10	Public, Executive Members for Leisure and Adult Health and Social Care	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of City Development ed.mylan@leeds.gov.uk

Award of care and support contract(s) for 17 bed autism supported living service (Branding Court) from autism supported living framework agreement To agree the award of the contracts for the service	Director of Adult Social Services	24/6/10	Service users and carers will be involved in selecting providers from the framework agreement	A Delegated Decision Panel Report	Director of Adult Social Services helen.gee@leeds.gov.uk
Domiciliary Care Strategy To approve proposed changes including the development of a reablement service	Executive Board (Portfolio: Adult Health and Social Care)	21/7/10	Area Committees and Ward Councillors	The report is to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Adult Social Services lynda.bowen@leeds.gov.uk
Residential Care Strategy for Older People in Leeds Approval to consult on options for future provision of long term residential care services	Executive Board (Portfolio: Adult Health and Social Care)	21/7/10	All stakeholders	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Adult Social Services dennis,holmes@leeds.gov.uk
Neighbourhood Network Services Review outcome and approval of the way forward for the award of contracts	Executive Board (Portfolio: Adult Health and Social Care)	21/7/10	Neighbourhood Network Review Panel	The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Adult Social Services dennis.holmes@leeds.gov.uk
Self Directed Support Recent progress report on SDS implementation and agree start date for SDS and all new customers	Executive Board (Portfolio: Adult Health and Social Care)	21/7/10		The report to be issued to the decision maker with the agenda for the meeting	Director of Adult Social Services john.lennon@leeds.gov.uk

**Appendix 3 - Suggested work areas from the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board
2009/10**

SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION	SOURCE REPORT
Requested further investigation into Crisis Support. To consider the service provided compared to the needs across the city, access to the service and how the service is communicated to those who may need crisis support.	Supporting Working Age Adults with Severe and Enduring Mental Health Problems - DRAFT
Residential Care Strategy for Older People in Leeds	Annual Report 2009/10
Domiciliary care services and reablement services	Annual Report 2009/10

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2

Council Committees' Terms of Reference

Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)

1. In relation to **Adult Services**¹ to exercise the functions of a Scrutiny Board including the following:

- (a) to review or scrutinise the exercise of any council or executive function, or any other related matter²;
- (b) to make reports or recommendations to Council or the Executive in connection with the exercise of any functions of the Council or the Executive;
- (c) to receive and review external audit and inspection reports;
- (d) to act as the appropriate Scrutiny Board³ in relation to the Executive's initial proposals for a plan or strategy within the Budget and Policy Framework;
- (e) to review corporate performance indicators and to make such reports and recommendations as it considers appropriate;
- (f) to undertake value for money reviews;
- (g) to review outcomes, targets and priorities within the Leeds Strategic Plan and to make such reports and recommendations as it considers appropriate; and
- (h) to review or scrutinise executive decisions made but not implemented.⁴

2. To receive and monitor formal responses to any reports or recommendations made by the Board.

¹ These are the functions delegated to the Director of Adult Social Services under the officer delegation scheme (council functions) and the officer delegation scheme (executive functions), including matters pertaining to outside bodies and partnerships to which appointments have been made by the authority

² including matters pertaining to outside bodies and partnerships to which appointments have been made by the authority

³ under the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules

⁴ which have been called-in under Rule 21 of the Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board: Adult Social Care

Date: 23rd June 2010

Subject: Determining the Work Programme 20010/11

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to determine the Board's work programme for 2010/11.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 The previous Agenda item provided inputs to the development of the Board's work programme. Having considered the written information and having discussed relevant issues with those present at the meeting, the Board is now asked to consider formulating a draft work programme.

2.2 In formulating work programme the Scrutiny Board shall determine;

- how the proposed inquiry meets criteria approved from time to time by the Scrutiny Advisor Group (Attached as Appendix 1)
- whether the programme can be adequately resourced and timetabled.(Appendix 2)

3.0 Recommendations

3.1 Members are requested to consider the Board's work programme.

Background Papers

Council's Constitution - Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules

SCRUTINY BOARD PROCEDURE RULES GUIDANCE NOTE 7

INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Scrutiny Board Procedure Rules require Scrutiny Boards, before deciding to undertake an Inquiry, to:

Consider how a proposed Inquiry meets criteria approved from time to time; and

Consult with any relevant Director and Executive Member

- 1.2 This is to ensure that Scrutiny Boards, when agreeing to undertake an Inquiry, have considered carefully the reasons for that Inquiry, its objectives, whether it can be adequately resourced in terms of Member and Officer time and have sought the views of the relevant Director and Executive Member.
- 1.3 The decision whether to undertake an Inquiry or not rests with the Scrutiny Board.

2.0 INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

- 2.1 At the time of deciding to undertake an Inquiry, the Scrutiny Board will refer to the Inquiry Selection Criteria within this Guidance Note and formally identify which of the agreed criteria the proposed Inquiry meets. The Board will also record the comments of the relevant Director and Executive Member. This process will be recorded in the Scrutiny Board minutes.

INQUIRY SELECTION CRITERIA

Scrutiny Board _____

Inquiry Title _____

Anticipated Start Date _____

Anticipated Finish Date _____

The Inquiry meets the following criteria

- It addresses the Council's agreed Strategic outcomes by reviewing the effectiveness of policy to achieve strategic outcomes as defined by the Leeds Strategic Plan
- Shaping and developing policy through influencing pre-policy discussion

It fulfils a performance management function by

- Reviewing performance of significant parts of service
- Addressing a poor performing service
- Addressing a high level of user dissatisfaction with the service
- Addressing a pattern of budgetary overspends
- Addressing matters raised by external auditors and inspectors

- Addresses an issue of high public interest
- Reviews a Major or Key Officer decision
- Reviews an Executive Board decision
- Reviews a series of decisions which have a significant impact _____
- Has been requested by the Executive Board/Full Council/Scrutiny Advisory Group
- looks at innovative change

Comments of relevant Director and Executive Member (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

**Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Work Programme 2010/11**

Meeting date – June 2010			
Legislation and Constitutional Changes	To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on proposed changes to the Council's Constitution in relation to Scrutiny.		B
Co-opted Members	To receive and consider a report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on Co-opted Members.		B
2010/11 Work Programme	Input to the Boards Work Programme 2010/11 - Sources of Work and Establishing the Boards Priorities and Determining the Work Programme 2010/11.		B
Inquiry into Personal Budgets and Self Directed Support – Response from Director and Executive Board	To receive and update on the formal response to the inquiry by the Director(s) identified in the recommendations and the views of the Executive Board	This report submitted to Executive Board in May 2010	PM

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

**Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Work Programme 2010/11**

Item	Description	Notes	Type of item
Meeting date – July/August 2010			
Performance Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarter 4 information for 2009/10 (Jan-March) Adaptations Performance Information 	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Draft Mental Health Inquiry	Supporting Working Age Adults with severe and Enduring Mental Health Problems - The draft report is brought before the board for consideration and where the content is agreed, its approval.		PM/D
Commissioning in Adult Social Care	To consider an update report on commissioning within Adult Social Services. Including the Independent Review of Leeds Neighbourhood Networks.	6-monthly report. – Previous March 10 Lead Officer – Dennis Holmes/ Tim O’Shea	PM
LINK Annual Report			
Safeguarding Board – Annual Report	The board is requested to consider the Annual report and make recommendation as necessary.	The report is scheduled to be presented at the xxx Executive Board.	PM

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

**Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Work Programme 2010/11**

Meeting date – September 2010			
Inquiry into Adaptations – Performance Updates and Recommendation Tracking	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board June 2009		PM MSR
Performance Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 1 information for 2010/11 (April -June) • Recommendation 2+5+7 – SDS inquiry Report • Adaptations Performance Information 	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Homecare Provision	Performance Report on homecare provision across the city, including independent sector providers.	Last update November 2009	PM
Inquiry into Transitional Arrangements Recommendation Tracking	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board 11 May 2010	Scheduled for Exec Board July 2010	PM MSR
Leeds Strategic Plan and Vision	To receive a formal consultation report. This will provide details of proposed Vision aims, Local Strategic Plan and Business Plan priorities.	Lead Officer – Jane Stageman	DP

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) Work Programme 2010/11

Care Quality Commission – self assessment report	To receive an update on the self assessment report due to be submitted to the Care Quality Commission which will determine the annual rating for the service.	Lead Officer – Sandie Keene	PM
Meeting date – October 2010			
Scope for Inquiry here			
Mental Health Crisis support???	Single Item Agenda		
Meeting date – November 2010			

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) Work Programme 2010/11

Leeds Strategic Plan and Vision	Scrutiny Board involvement in target setting process, linked to the Leeds Strategic Plan and Business Plan priorities	Lead officer – Jane Stageman	DP
Meeting date – December 2010			
Adult Social Services-Annual Review Report (2009/10)	To consider the outcome of the annual rating review undertaken by the Care Quality Commission for 2009/10	Scheduled to be presented to Executive Board xx/xx/xx	PM

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) Work Programme 2010/11

Recommendation tracking for Mental Health Inquiry.	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board July 2010. Report to include update on MHNA and three year commissioning plan.		
Performance Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 2 information for 2010/11 (July - Sept) • Recommendation 2+5+7 – SDS inquiry Report • Adaptations Performance Information 	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Inquiry into Personal Budgets and Self Directed Support Recommendation Tracking	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board March 2010		PM MSR
Meeting date – January 2011			
Leeds Strategic Plan and Vision	Composite report to be submitted to Scrutiny Board for agreement prior to submission to Executive Board as part of the Budget and Policy Framework	Lead Officer – Jane Stageman	DP
Inquiry into Adaptations – Performance Updates and Recommendation Tracking	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board June 09		PM MSR

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

**Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Work Programme 2010/11**

Meeting date – February 2011			
Safeguarding Update	To consider an update report since the implementation of performance measures to improve Adult Safeguarding.	Six monthly update since the presentation of the Annual Report . Lead Officer – Dennis Holmes or Independent Chair	
Commissioning in Adult Social Care	To consider an update report on commissioning within Adult Social Services. Including Rec 6 – Mental Health Inquiry if not resolved by Dec 2010	6-monthly report. – Previous July 2010. Lead Officer – Dennis Holmes/ Tim O’Shea	PM
Statement IWC Action Plan Recommendation Tracking	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board 11 May 2010	Scheduling for Exec Board July 2010	PM MSR

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) Work Programme 2010/11

Meeting date – March 2011			
Homecare Provision	Performance Report on homecare provision across the city, including independent sector providers.	Last update September 2010	PM
Performance Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarter 3 information for 2010/11 (Oct - Dec) • Recommendation 2+5+7 – SDS inquiry Report • Adaptations Performance Information 	All Scrutiny Boards receive performance information on a quarterly basis	PM
Inquiry into Personal Budgets and Self Directed Support Recommendation Tracking	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board March 2010		PM MSR
Meeting date – April 2011			
Inquiry Reports and Statements	Board to agree inquiry reports and statements.		

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

**Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Work Programme 2010/11**

Annual Report	To agree the Board's contribution to the annual scrutiny report		
Inquiry into Transitional Arrangements Recommendation Tracking	To receive a performance update and consider progress made from recommendations made by ASC Board 11 May 2010		PM MSR

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

**Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Work Programme 2010/11**

Working Groups			
Working group	Membership	Progress update	Dates
<i>Proposals working group</i>	<i>Cllr. Judith Chapman</i> <i>Previous years co-optees</i> <i>Joy Fisher (co-optee)</i> <i>Sally Morgan (co-optee)</i> <i>Vacancies</i>		<i>Suggested Dates</i>
<i>2 other working group for 2010/11</i>	<i>Area for inquiry to be agreed</i>		

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

**Draft Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Work Programme 2010/11**

Unscheduled / Potential Items		
Item	Description	Notes
Leeds City Council provided Home Care services	To consider the provision of directly provided services. The provision of range and choice. Quality of care, impact of personalisation, and VFM	Lead Officer –
Day Centre Review	Further to the special meeting in August 2009. The board may wish to consider the impact of the changes implemented and if further investigation needs to be made into this area.	Lead Officer -

Key:			
RFS	Request for scrutiny	MSR	Monitoring scrutiny recommendations
PM	Performance management	B	Briefings (Including potential areas for scrutiny)
RP	Review of existing policy	SC	Statutory consultation
DP	Development of new policy	CI	Call in

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: S Newbould

Tel:24744792

Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

Scrutiny Board Adult Social Care

Date: 23rd June 2010

Subject: Inquiry Report, Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets– Formal Response

Electoral Wards Affected: All

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 From March 2009 until December 2009, the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) conducted an inquiry on Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets. At the conclusion of the inquiry a report was issued on the 17th March 2010 setting out its conclusions and recommendations. This report is attached as Appendix 1.
- 1.2 It is the normal practice to request a formal response from the relevant Directorate(s) to the Board's recommendations, once a report has been issued.
- 1.3 On the 19th May 2010, the proposed response to the recommendations was submitted by the Director of Adult Social Services to the Council's Executive Board, who accepted the actions detailed in the response. This report is attached as Appendix 2.
- 1.4 The Executive Board Resolved that the proposed responses, as detailed within the submitted report, be approved.
- 1.5 Any recommendations which have not yet been completed will be included in future recommendation tracking reports to enable the Board to continue to monitor progress.

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 Members are asked to consider the responses provided and to decide whether further scrutiny involvement is required.

3.0 Background Papers

Executive Board Minutes – Meeting 19 May 2010.

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Inquiry Report

Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets

Scrutiny Board – Adult Social Care
17th March 2010

Scrutiny Inquiry Final report Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets.

17th March 2010



Introduction and Scope

Introduction

1. At its meeting on 8 October 2008, the Executive Board received an update on the work undertaken in Leeds to prepare for the personalisation agenda, since the publication of the concordat “Putting People First” in December 2007. At that meeting, the Executive Board resolved that the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) be requested to monitor progress of the personalisation agenda.
2. The concordat outlined the vision and direction for the development of adult social care services in the future and summarised the main issues to be addressed by all Local Authorities if they are to deliver successful change. We acknowledge that the need to modernise social care services is essential to facilitate the provision and funding of a more flexible service, which in turn will enable people to have more choice and control over their care services.
3. One of a number of initiatives contributing to service transformation is Self Directed Support (SDS) and personal budgets. Throughout this inquiry we have gained an insight into the significant level of change required in the way assessment and care management should be delivered by the council and our partners.
4. To assist the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board in monitoring progress of the personalisation agenda, in line with the Executive Board request, the Scrutiny Board requested that a scoping paper be presented for discussion. An initial scoping discussion was held at the Proposals Working Group meeting on 12 December 2008. The working group agreed to focus on the following areas:
 - The common assessment framework;
 - Resource allocation system
 - Progress of the early implementer project.
5. Terms of reference for this inquiry were agreed at our Board meeting on the 7th January 2009 and further updated terms were agreed on the 29th July 2009.
6. We considered the best approach for carrying out this inquiry and concluded that by establishing a personalisation working group we would have the capacity to undertake the inquiry in greater detail. The members of the working group were:

Cllr Judith Chapman - Chair
Cllr Stuart Andrew – until 21/05/2009
Cllr Suzie Armitage- until 21/05/2009
Cllr Penny Ewens
Joy Fisher
Sally Morgan
Cllr Alan Taylor – until 16/11/2009
Cllr James McKenna – from 17/06/2009
Cllr Vonnie Morgan – from 17/06/2009
Cllr Valerie Kendall – from 29/07/2009
7. Throughout the inquiry the working group regularly reviewed the terms of reference and where necessary introduced other areas for consideration to facilitate a thorough inquiry into this complex area.
8. This inquiry commenced in the 2008/9 municipal year. The modernisation of Adult Social Care is a long term change programme of which Self Directed Support is a major influential factor. Due consideration of evidence has taken place over a ten month period during



Introduction and Scope

which we have witnessed the evolution of the Early Implementer Pilot project and the many benefits that a personalised budget can bring to an individual wishing to have more choice and control over the services they wish to receive.

9. We feel it is important to recognise the roles and responsibilities which the Adult Social Services Department has for the delivery of Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets. We also feel it is important to recognise the significant work already undertaken and which continues on a daily basis to further develop and deliver this objective.
10. At the time the inquiry was undertaken the provision of Personal Budgets were due to become a mainstream service in April 2010. Subsequently the Early Implementer Pilot project has been extended to invite under represented groups to join such as Older People and Mental Health Service Users. Personal Budgets will now be offered to the wider public including all new customers from July 2010. The cultural and transformation change for Adult Social Services and partners will continue to evolve long after this date. In addition lessons can still be learnt from projects such as the Early Implementer Pilot and feedback can be obtained and evaluated from service users and experts.
11. We are very grateful to everyone who gave their time to participate in this inquiry and for their commitment in helping us to understand, review and monitor this area.

Scope of the Inquiry

12. Recognising the range of stakeholders involved and responsible for the delivery and success of Self Directed Support, we received a range of evidence both in written and verbal form from the following:
 - Officers from Adult Social Services
 - Experts by Experience
 - Personal Assistants
 - Peer Support Group
13. The Experts by Experience who joined us provided a valuable insight into their involvement in the Early Implementer Pilot. During one session we asked 'What change if any has a personal budget made to your life?' We did not truly appreciate until this point that enabling a person to control their social care investment can add significant value and enjoyment when doing things in life which most of us take for granted.

'I can't wait to have a Personal Assistant to help me to look after my grandson. This will also give my husband some respite and also enable me to visit places such as art galleries or attend poetry readings.'

'I am looking forward to being able to go to the quiz night, which was something I previously enjoyed doing. I like to go out and about, a personal assistant will help me to do this.'



Introduction and Scope

14. The inquiry consisted of eight working group sessions, the presentation of written information and feedback from individuals who are involved in the pilot, provide care and support to those in receipt of a personal budget or provide peer support. Further information relating to each of these sessions is detailed at the end of this report.
15. In order to promote our level of understanding we were advised about Leeds City Council's vision to transform Adult Social Care Services to incorporate a system of Self Directed Support at the very beginning of the inquiry.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

16. During the course of this inquiry we conducted investigations into many aspects of Self Directed Support. The focus of our conclusions and recommendations is predominantly on those aspects which we felt required attention and does not reflect every aspect of the inquiry itself.

17. A very timely and important report was provided to us at the latter end of the inquiry, the Phase 1 Early Implementer Evaluation Report. This encompassed the views of an evaluation team which comprised of Audit, an Expert by Experience and a Consultant who focused on the following areas

- Self Directed Assessment Questionnaire
- Resource Allocation System
- Support Planning
- Accessing Budget
- Organising Support
- Review

18. Five high priority areas highlighted in the report caused us significant concern particularly around budgets and financial management. We welcome this report as it specifies defined areas for improvement and also supports some of the conclusions determined by the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board.

Case Assessment and Review

19. A fundamental part of the assessment process is the completion of an assessment questionnaire which enables the service user to quantify the

scope and range of personal care they require.

20. We were advised that the format of the Self Directed Assessment Questionnaire (SDAQ) is based on forms produced by other authorities, also taking advice from 'In Control' (supports local authorities to deliver SDS) and those users who had completed the SDAQ.

21. The second version of the SDAQ was presented to us and the Experts for discussion. It was acknowledged that version two of the form reflected considerable improvement in structure and simplicity however we consider that Part B would still be difficult to quantify.

22. We were concerned that it would be very difficult for many people to express a situation or a way of life on paper. The Experts advised us that they would not be able to fill the form in on their own and would have to seek assistance from parents, friends or associates. One Expert added that both she and her husband are articulate, literate people and it took two hours to complete the form. Subsequently the Care Manager still found inconsistencies, which highlighted how arduous the form is to complete.

23. We are acutely aware that service users are routinely required to provide repetitive information when applying for local authority or NHS support. We were determined to identify what steps were being taken to minimise this. We were informed that a single assessment process should be in place across health and social care in Leeds. It is acknowledged that further attention is required to the whole process of assessment to ensure that all those



Conclusions and Recommendations

wishing to access Social Care or Health Services can do so by going through one assessment process, which we welcome.

Recommendation 1 – That the Director of Adult Social Services ensures best practice guidance, the requirement for a single assessment process and feedback from service users continue to be considered to improve the structure and composition of the Self Directed Assessment Questionnaire which will aid completion and remove barriers for service users.

24. We are aware that services users are not left to their own devices when completing the SDAQ and that care manager support is provided over an average of two visits. Once a support plan is in place there is a requirement for this to be reviewed, which includes a spending audit. A review will be conducted 3 months after the first assessment followed by regular reviews which in most cases will be annually.

25. Leeds City Council Care Managers involved in the process may recommend that a review is undertaken at more regular intervals where necessary, particularly if there is a concern about an individual's ability to manage their own budget. The Experts added that it is essential that there is input from both a Care Manager and Carer(s) when filling out the questionnaire to ensure that all aspects of care are covered realistically and that forms are filled in correctly.

26. We expressed apprehension about the high demand for local authority care manager support required to complete the SDAQ and support plans, which the

Experts and ourselves consider to be fundamental. We are further concerned that there will be a substantial requirement for this resource intensive service from July 2010 onwards, when the number of service users will significantly increase. At the time of the investigation it was not possible to accurately quantify the resource impact personal budgets would have on care manager resources once the service is extended to the wider public.

Recommendation 2 – That the Director of Adult Social Services updates the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board (or its successor board) on the resource impact of Self Directed Support and the capacity to provide timely case assessments and reviews for service users within the constraints of current or planned staffing structures. This information is to be provided in conjunction with the quarterly performance report.

27. Self Directed Support should be accessible to all in order to enable people to choose services in line with their preferences and improve quality of life. We determined that other sectors of the community may struggle to complete the SDAQ due to language barriers making it difficult for service users to define their own needs.

28. We were advised that the department is aware of the cultural and language issues that may cause difficulties and that the questionnaire can be produced in different languages upon request. However this is only part of the assessment process as service users cannot complete forms unaided. We therefore feel it important that provision is made to deliver support which is



Conclusions and Recommendations

adaptable and sufficiently skilled to communicate in different languages, including sign language, to enable the competition of the SDAQ.

Recommendation 3 – That the Director of Adult Social Services ensures the support functions utilised by customers (provided either directly or commissioned by Leeds City Council) are adequately skilled to overcome the barriers of understanding that may prevent access to Self Directed Support.

The Resource Allocation System (RAS), Financial Management and Value for Money.

29. We were advised that The Resource Allocation System is an Adult Social Services tool for calculating the allocation of money to service users so that they can have greater levels of choice and control over the services they receive.
30. The resource allocation system uses a points system which determines how much money is allocated based on a persons completed questionnaire (SDAQ). The SDAQ is point scored and funding is allocated on a pounds per point basis. The RAS has been accurate in calculating a personal budget in 80 – 90% of cases. Where an individual has complex needs an alternative method of calculation was being utilised.
31. Local Authorities in general have developed their own RAS. We were advised however of the potential development of a national RAS which should create consistency. It is evident to us however that this will not remove disparity in funding between different authority areas whilst financial support is provided from Adult Social Services budgets which are within the control of the local authority.
32. We acknowledge that the RAS was being trialled throughout the inquiry in order to iron out anomalies. A contingency is in place to minimise detrimental impact however we were concerned by the Internal Audit findings, as detailed in the Early Implementer Report, which specified that there is a significantly high level of human error when inputting information and questioned if the calculation process is open, transparent and fair. We were reassured that no one taking part in the Early Implementer pilot is being disadvantaged financially, however we expect further work to be undertaken to rectify the significant issue raised.
33. We sought clarity to identify what system is in place should the service user disagree with the resource allocated. We were dissatisfied by the absence of a clear and defined time period for the convening of the Representations Panel. We believe that the documented process should be clearly time defined to remove uncertainty for employees, service users and carers. Those going down the Self Directed Support route should have access to information which advises them of the process in the event of a disagreement.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Recommendation 4 - That the Director of Adult Social Services reviews the Representations Process before October 2010, to incorporate clearly defined timescales in which a disagreement regarding funding allocations would aim to be resolved. In addition the rights of the individual to request a review by the Representations Panel should be stressed and clearly communicated during the assessment/review process.

34. It is acknowledged that the modernisation of the Social Care system in this country will generate significant challenges ahead and to generate funding for personal budgets it is necessary to release funds by reconfiguring existing services.
35. At the time evidence was presented to us 21 budgets had been assessed, however we were very concerned there was a £55,449 cost increase when compared to the previous care packages provided. We appreciate that the majority of the increase was attributable to 3 specific atypical cases. However, this significant increase, factored with the requirement to substantially amplify the number of service users in receipt of self directed support, raises considerable concerns around affordability particularly with the current economic pressures faced by Leeds City Council. Our concerns are echoed in the Early Implementer Evaluation report.
36. It is evident that choice and control cannot be delivered at any cost, particularly when there is a finite budget

to work within. We are aware of the potential significant financial pressures that could be created during this transitional period of change, and that a careful balance of expenditure on traditional care services and Self Directed Support will need to be carefully managed to minimise financial risk and ensure service sustainability.

37. 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. We have determined however that this area should be closely monitored by the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board.

Recommendation 5 – That the Director of Adult Social Services updates the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board (or its successor board) on a quarterly basis on the budgetary impact of Self Directed Support and financial pressures created throughout the municipal years 2010/11 and 2011/12.

The Risk Enablement Framework and Safeguarding.

38. During a number of working group sessions we have expressed our concern about obtaining the right balance between choice and control and the potential for increased risk to the service user. We also expressed our reservations about the inconsistencies in the freedoms for an individual to spend their budget on what they deem appropriate and the authority view on what is appropriate. We were advised



Conclusions and Recommendations

an individual has the right to choose how they spend their budget within an acceptable and agreed level of risk.

have been made. If problems are identified then an assessment review is undertaken.

39. Some activities may seem initially to have little apparent social care benefit, the example given was the purchase of a season ticket for the football. However, on reflection activities such as this can be therapeutic, provide social interaction for the individual and provide some respite for main carers. The Early Implementer Evaluation Report specifies that there should be a Support Plan Policy which defines the types of support which are acceptable/not acceptable and offers clear guidance to care managers and service users. We agree that this policy is fundamental and necessary to provide clarity to service users and those employed to deliver care and support.

42. It was stated to us that accountability in risk management needs to be embedded to ensure that front line staff feel confident to make judgments and remain accountable for decisions made without the need for escalation. We hope that this is implemented successfully in order to minimise unnecessary delays in the assessment process.

40. A copy of the draft risk policy was presented to us which defines how risk is identified and how this can be managed at an acceptable level. It was explained to us that risk cannot be completely eliminated without removing an individual's choice and control and that risk taking is inevitable and a part of every day life. However, service users who wish to utilise a personal budget will undergo a risk assessment to make sure risk is reduced to an acceptable level ensuring adequate safeguarding arrangements are put into place.

43. We were keen to identify what recourse the service user would have if there was a disagreement about the acceptable level of risk. We were advised that if no agreed strategy to reduce risk to an acceptable level can be found, and the service user wishes to proceed, then referral to a manager will be required. Where this step fails a manager may refer the case up the line management structure to an appropriate senior manager, who will assist in a final decision as to whether the organisation is willing to accept the risk or not. Potentially the matter could be escalated to the Local Authority Ombudsman.

41. We were reassured that funding is not released before an agreed support plan has been seen which includes identification and analysis of risk. Such risk assessments are monitored to ensure that everything is operating within the known boundaries and to guarantee that the correct decisions

44. We have determined that there is a level of ambiguity about this method of resolution with regard to time scales. It is in the interest of the service user to be able to request that disputes be dealt with in a structured and time defined manner, an example being the Representations Procedure (with reference to recommendation 4). The process should be clear and transparent, particularly as monies will not be released until such time as a care plan is agreed.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Recommendation 6 – That the Director of Adult Social Services reviews the current procedure for resolving risk disputes before October 2010, to empower the service user with the right to request their case be reviewed in accordance with a defined time process and also provides the opportunity for the service user to make representation.

Performance Management and Reporting Mechanisms

45. The Department of Health has stated that local authorities must have a minimum of 30% of users, who are eligible for community based support, using Self Directed Support by the 31st of March 2011 to ensure a good performance rating. National Indicator 130 measures the number of adults, older people and carers receiving self-directed support (personal budget or a direct payment) in the year to 31st March as a percentage of clients receiving community based services and carers receiving carer's specific services aged 18 and over.

46. We have been reassured that Leeds City Council will achieve 15% by 31st March 2010 initially and 30% by 2011.

Recommendation 7 – That the Director of Adult Social Services updates the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board (or its successor board) on performance against NI 130 on a quarterly basis in conjunction with the quarterly Performance Monitoring Report.

Stakeholder Engagement, Communication and Consultation.

47. We were reassured by the presentation of the Communications Strategy which clearly defined the planned promotion of the service and engagement with stakeholders. Published flyers, booklets and the most recent newsletter were exhibited to us. In addition we were advised of awareness raising media planned for production.

48. We stated that I.T. based assistance will be of no benefit for those without I.T. skills however we were reassured that quality information would be provided in both hard copy and online and that hard copy information would be bespoke to suit the users needs, i.e. large print or Braille.

49. Experience has unfortunately led us to the conclusion that information is not always in adequate supply or properly displayed and we feel it is important to stress that hard copy information should be readily available at all our publicly accessible buildings.

50. It was reported to us that all those taking part in the pilot are doing so voluntarily. We were advised that there is an under representation of older people and mental health service users and that steps have already been taken to employ a temporary specialist mental health worker to work with the Early Implementer team to encourage take up from those who have mental health support needs. We are aware that as part of the overall Self Directed Support



Conclusions and Recommendations

Communications Strategy a range of communications materials will be produced to target specific groups including existing and potential service users and different stakeholder groups as appropriate.

51. We consider that the pilot would have benefited from the inclusion of older service users, and welcome the news that the project will be extended until the end of June 2010 to provide the opportunity for inclusion. We appreciate the benefit of general communication to the public initially in order to reach the wider audience but once the focus becomes specific this stakeholder group should be prioritised in order to promote take up and feedback.

Recommendation 8 – That the Director of Adult Social Services delivers a targeted campaign before December 2010 aimed at older people to raise awareness and to promote the benefits of Self Directed Support.

Brokerage Services and the Pathways to Establishing and Managing Support.

52. Brokerage involves assisting people who have personal budgets or who fund their own services by finding out what options are available or providing information (signposting). It can also involve giving technical advice, encouraging and developing informal support, coordinating support and resources, helping manage obligations and

responsibilities in relation to budgets and more importantly making things happen.

53. This facilitating function covers a wide range of individuals, such as friends or family, and organisations who provide help. This function is not restricted to specialised independent support organisations. We found it encouraging that progress has been made for Leeds Centre for Integrated Living to provide an external brokerage function in addition to that provided by council care managers.
54. Representatives from the Peer Support Group provided an overview of their role in giving assistance to those who manage their own social care services. In order to provide an effective service across Leeds a dedicated phone line was established which became operational on the 1st of June 2009. Interestingly they advised us that the majority of callers were from the older community, 50% aged 70+. A website was also in construction to enable internet access to information.
55. It was evident that the employment of staff to enable flexibility in conducting every day events or social activities was a very important factor to the experts, particularly the employment of Personal Assistants. We were interested to identify what assistance would be provided in helping a service user employ the right person and was advised that ASIST can provide valuable help (ASIST = Leeds City Council's Actively Seeking Independence Support Team, part of the Leeds Centre for Independent Living). It is also strongly recommended that people take up Criminal Record Bureau checks which ASIST will facilitate, however it is up to



Conclusions and Recommendations

the individual to decide if this is necessary. There are circumstances where the potential employee may be a long and trusted friend or relative.

56. When discussing the potential for a breakdown in care arrangement we asked the experts if they would know where to go if they needed assistance or support. Unfortunately they were not aware of the help available to them should this occur and assumed that they would have to call on friends and family to provide the emergency care they needed. We were advised that if there was a problem long term with support arrangements this would trigger a care review.

Recommendation 9 – The Director of Adult Social Services makes necessary provision to ensure individual support plans clearly identify the short term and emergency back up arrangements should a breakdown in care occur. Arrangements should be stressed and clearly communicated to those in receipt of Self Directed Support and where appropriate to carers and family members.

57. We are concerned that there may not be sufficiently trained personal assistants in the market place to meet the demand that Self Directed Support will create, particularly to provide emergency support, and consider that Leeds City Council has a clear responsibility in helping to shape the market.

Partnership Working, Commissioning and Social Enterprise.

58. It is evident that involvement of other organisations is fundamental to the success of Self Directed Support. We were particularly pleased to know that extensive work had already been undertaken to form partnerships and set up a project board with organisations such as NHS Leeds, NHS Care Services, Leeds Partnership Foundation Trust, other Leeds City Council service areas and the voluntary sector. Work is also being undertaken to review commissioning arrangements with a view to arrange joint service contracts in the future.

59. Recognising that service transformation will have a great impact on commissioned services we asked what was being done to support service providers through this uncertain process and also develop local social enterprise.

60. It was explained that the potential increase of relatively small contacts will be more intensive to monitor for quality and value for money compared to a lower number of large scale contacts. However small service providers can deliver a more focused and localised service. We were advised that Leeds City Council is working with providers to help them adapt their services to meet the needs of those with personal budgets and we hope that Council procurement processes do not hinder this development. The need to move away from block contracting was also highlighted to us whilst stimulating the market to fill any gaps in service provision.



Conclusions and Recommendations

61. We welcomed the news that a Social Enterprise Development Officer is now situated in procurement whose role it is to promote social enterprise and that all companies will eventually be required to undergo assessment by the Care Quality Commission which should create reassurance of their viability and capabilities. In addition Leeds City Council has undergone a process of costing in house provision to enable those on personal budgets to buy services direct.

line staff within our partner organisations to have the necessary skills to provide advice and therefore we encourage the continued delivery of training to our partner organisations by Adult Social Services.

Workforce Transformation and Development

62. We were advised that a suite of training has been developed to meet the requirements of a range of staff. We were also reassured that customer service staff at West Gate and the One Stop Shops would also be offered a tailored version of Self Directed Support training so that they are prepared to respond to the wider public from April 2010.

63. We did express some concern that not all training, including risk assessment training would be delivered before April 2010, we therefore feel that the delayed introduction of Personal Budgets to the wider population will provide further opportunity to deliver training in the intervening period.

64. It is also evident to us that the first point of contact for a service user seeking Self Directed Support advice would not always be directly with Adult Social Services. We feel it important for front



Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

Reports and Publications Submitted

- Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development, Personalisation – 12th December 2008
- Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development, Personalisation – 7th January 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Personalisation Task Group (previously named Self Direct Members Forum) – 16th March 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Self Directed Support – Resource Allocation System (RAS) – 22nd April 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Update on the Implementation of Self Directed Support for Leeds – 22nd April 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Early Implementer Progress Update – 30th July 2009
- Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development, Personalisation – Update to Terms of Reference and Appointment of co-opted member to the Personalisation Working Group – 29th July 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Self Directed Support The Assessment and Review Processes – 30th July 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Customer Engagement, Involvement and Consultation – 14th August 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Self Directed Support – Partnership Working Update – 18th September 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, The Single Assessment Process - so people 'only need to tell their story once' – 18th September 2009.
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Brokerage update – 18th September 2009
- Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development, Personalisation Working Group – Update Report – 7th October 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Self Directed Support – Resource Allocation System (RAS) – 15th October 2009



Reports and Publications Submitted (continued)

- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Early Implementer Update, Evaluation and Experiences of Care Managers and Support Officers – 15th October 2009
- Report of the Head of Service, Support and Enablement, Self Directed Support and Adaptations – 11th November 2009
- Report of Chief Officer for Access and Inclusion, Adult Social Care Workforce development update Self Directed Support Programme – 11th November 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Performance Management and Performance Reporting Mechanisms: How the Challenge of Meeting Government SDS targets will be Met – 11th November 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Commissioned Services and Social Enterprise, The Requirement to Adapt and Change – 11th November 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Risk Management Framework and Protecting the Customer – 10th December 2009
- Report of the Director of Adult Social Services, Early Implementer Evaluation and Action Plan – 10th December 2009
- Report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development, Scrutiny Inquiry: Personalisation Working Group Update Report – 13th January 2010

Presentations

Personalisation in Leeds – 16th March 2009

The Resource Allocation System – 22nd April 2009

Personalisation of Adult Social Care – 30th July 2009

Action Plans and Guidance Documents

Terms of Reference - Adult Social Care Self Directed Support Working Group

Guidance and Notes for Support Planning

Green Paper – July 2009 Shaping the Future of Care Together – A Brief Summary & Key Issues.

The Self Directed Support Operating Model

Risk Policy - Risk: Identification, assessment and management in Adult Social Care

Early Implementer Evaluation - Final Report November 2009

Action Plan - Evaluation of Early Implementer



Working Group Sessions

1st Session – 16th March 2009

- Self Directed Support Overview
- Personalisation Task Group (previously The Self Directed Support Members Forum)

2nd Session – 22nd April 2009

- Personalisation Update Report
- The Resource Allocation System

3rd Session – 30th July 2009

- Self Directed Assessment Questionnaire (SDAQ)
- The Process of Assessment and Review
- Early Implementer Pilot Progress Update

4th Session – 14th August 2009

- Customer Engagement, Involvement and Consultation
- Peer Group Support

5th Session – 18th September 2009

- Partnership Working
- Brokerage Services and the Pathways to Establishing and Managing Support
- The Single Assessment Process, so people 'only need to tell their story once'

6th Session – 15th October 2009

- Early Implementer Update, Evaluation and Experiences of Care Managers and Support Officers
- Financial Budgets and Value for Money

7th Session – 11th November 2009

- Performance management and reporting mechanisms and meeting the challenge of Government SDS targets
- Commissioned Services and Social Enterprise. The requirement to adapt and change
- Workforce Transformation and Development update

8th Session – 10th December 2009

- Risk Enablement Framework and safeguarding
- Early Implementer Evaluation Report



Witnesses Heard

John Lennon – Chief Officer, Access and Inclusion
Jemima Sparks – Service Delivery Manager West, Adult Social Care
Robert Russell – Principal Financial Manager
Sarfraz Khan – Financial Manager
Emma Lewis – Business Change Manager
Tizzy Taylor – Expert from Experience
Julie Rose – Expert from Experience
Joanne Smith - P.A to Julie Rose
Leonie Gregson – Communications Officer
Rob Moriarty – Expert from Experience, Peer Group Support
Sandra O'Donovan – Expert from Experience, Peer Group Support
Ann – Marie Simms – Care Manager
Claire Matson – Business Change Leader
Susan Morrell – Leeds Centre for Integrated Living
Tony Callaghan – Commissioning Officer
Graham Sephton – Deputy Head of HR
Richard Graham – Senior Quality Assurance Officer
Alex Firth – Principal Audit Manager
Jason Brook – Audit Manager

Dates of Scrutiny

12th December 2008 – Proposals Working Group
7th January 2009 – Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board
16th March 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
22nd April 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
29th July 2009 – Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board
30th July 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
14th August 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
18th September 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
7th October 2009 – Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board
15th October 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
11th November 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
10th December 2009 – Personalisation Working Group
13th January 2010 – Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board

**Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care)
Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets
17th March 2010**

Report author: Sandra Newbould

www.scrutiny.unit@leeds.gov.uk



This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: John Lennon

Tel: 0113 2478665

Report of the Director of Adult Social Services

Executive Board

Date: 19 May 2010

Subject: Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) Inquiry on Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets

Electoral Wards Affected:

Ward Members consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In

(Details contained in the report)

Executive Summary

This report provides the Executive Board with details of the recommendations from the recent Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board inquiry into Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets, and details how the Director proposes to respond to these. The report asks the Board to approve the proposed response.

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the Executive Board with the response of the Director of Adult Social Services to the recommendations resulting from the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) inquiry into Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets.

2.0 Background

2.1 At its meeting on 8 October 2008, the Executive Board received an update on the work undertaken in Leeds to prepare for the personalisation agenda, since the publication of the concordat "Putting People First" in December 2007. At that meeting, the Executive Board resolved that the Scrutiny Board (Adult Social Care) be requested to monitor progress of the personalisation agenda.

2.2 The inquiry commenced in the 2008/9 municipal year, and consisted of eight working group sessions, the presentation of written information and feedback from individuals who have been involved in the pilot of Self Directed Support in Leeds. On 17 March

2010, the report resulting from the Inquiry into Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets was published.

- 2.3 The report makes nine recommendations for action. The Director of Adult Social Services has accepted these recommendations and actions are underway or planned to address them. Progress will be monitored by the board as part of its regular recommendation monitoring activity.

3.0 Recommendations

- 3.1 This section lists each of the Scrutiny Board's nine recommendations, along with a response from the Director of Adult Social Services.

3.2 Recommendation One:

That the Director of Adult Social Services ensures best practice guidance, the requirement for a single assessment process and feedback from service users continue to be considered to improve the structure and composition of the Self Directed Assessment Questionnaire which will aid completion and remove barriers for service users.

This recommendation is agreed. Business Change resource will remain allocated to Self Directed Support until, and after, full implementation in order to monitor progress and feedback, and make further improvements to systems, processes and documentation including the Self Directed Assessment Questionnaire. This will include review of best practice guidance and feedback from service users. In terms of developing a single assessment process, we are continuing to work with our partners to further develop this documentation, make such changes as are required from time to time and extend its use through the health and voluntary sector. This work will continue, led through an interagency working group.

3.3 Recommendation Two:

That the Director of Adult Social Services updates the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board (or its successor board) on the resource impact of Self Directed Support and the capacity to provide timely case assessments and reviews for service users within the constraints of current or planned staffing structures. This information is to be provided in conjunction with the quarterly performance report.

This recommendation is agreed. Extensive monitoring of the uptake and impact of Self Directed Support is being undertaken on an ongoing basis, including the time taken by front line staff to complete assessment and support planning processes with service users. In addition, performance against National Indicators 132 and 133 (timeliness of assessments and service provision) is captured and monitored on an ongoing basis. The Director of Adult Social Services will provide the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board with information as to performance in this area in conjunction with the quarterly performance report.

3.4 Recommendation Three:

That the Director of Adult Social Services ensures the support functions utilised by customers (provided either directly or commissioned by Leeds City Council) are adequately skilled to overcome the barriers of understanding that may prevent access to Self Directed Support.

This recommendation is agreed. The department recognises the importance of ensuring Self Directed Support is accessible to all, so that all individuals may exercise increased choice and control. In addition, we are aware of the cultural and language difficulties that may cause difficulties for some individuals going through the assessment and support planning processes.

In order to mitigate against this, all documentation can be made available in different languages, in line with the corporate policy which states that translations can be produced on request, in cases where providing an interpreter will not meet the service user's need. Translation and interpreting services are available through the council's Central Interpreting and Translation Unit (CITU), including British Sign Language interpretation, and are utilised as needed. ASIST, who are commissioned to provide help and guidance to service users throughout the process, also provide interpreters through CITU whenever this is needed. In addition, various members of the ASIST team speak Punjabi, Putwari, Urdu, Miirpuri and Polish, and two have been trained to Level 2 British Sign Language.

In all cases, gender specific staff can be provided if required, and extra time and meetings can be provided for anyone who needs more time to fully understand the information and advice provided, for example, people who have learning difficulties and/or mental health issues. Workers will always consult and involve family members, friends and advocates if a service user wants this, and arrange meetings in a venue of the service user's choice.

3.5 Recommendation Four:

That the Director of Adult Social Services reviews the Representations Process before October 2010, to incorporate clearly defined timescales in which a disagreement regarding funding allocations would aim to be resolved. In addition the rights of the individual to request a review by the Representations Panel should be stressed and clearly communicated during the assessment/review process.

This recommendation is agreed. In the case of a disagreement regarding funding, or any other element of the process, the aim is to ensure early resolution through discussion between the service user, their care manager and the relevant team manager. If necessary, the matter can then be escalated through the line management structure to Head of Service, and an independent assessment can be commissioned if required. In addition to this, Adult Social Care has a representations process, which was developed when the FACS (Fair Access to Care) reviewing process was implemented, and allows cases to be considered by a panel of managers. The Directorate is currently reviewing this arrangement, alongside processes for dealing with disputes around risk (see recommendation six), to ensure any representation can be considered and resolved in an effective and timely manner. This review will be completed by July 2010. It should be noted that service users can also access the formal complaints procedure at any time; the timescales for response in such cases are currently under review

3.6 Recommendation Five:

That the Director of Adult Social Services updates the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board (or its successor board) on a quarterly basis on the budgetary impact of Self Directed Support and financial pressures created throughout the municipal years 2010/11 and 2011/12.

This recommendation is agreed. Extensive monitoring of the uptake and impact of Self Directed Support is being undertaken on an ongoing basis, including the budgetary impact. The Director of Adult Social Services will provide the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board with information about this and any related financial pressures, throughout 2010/11 and 2011/12.

3.7 Recommendation Six:

That the Director of Adult Social Services reviews the current procedure for resolving risk disputes before October 2010, to empower the service user with the right to request their case be reviewed in accordance with a defined time process and also provides the opportunity for the service user to make representation.

This recommendation is agreed. Scrutiny Working Group received a report regarding the new risk management policy, which applies across all assessment and care management functions, as part of their inquiry. This policy and associated risk screening and risk management tools is currently being piloted, and will be rolled out from April 2010. In addition to this, and linked to the review of the overall representations process, work is being undertaken to ensure any disputes over risk can be resolved in an effective and timely manner. Further reports will be provided to Scrutiny as this concludes.

3.8 Recommendation Seven:

That the Director of Adult Social Services updates the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board (or its successor board) on performance against NI 130 on a quarterly basis in conjunction with the quarterly Performance Monitoring Report.

This recommendation is agreed. Robust monitoring procedures are already in place to capture performance against NI130, and the Director of Adult Social Services will provide the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board with information as to performance in this area in conjunction with the quarterly performance report.

3.9 Recommendation Eight:

That the Director of Adult Social Services delivers a targeted campaign before December 2010 aimed at older people to raise awareness and to promote the benefits of Self Directed Support.

This recommendation is agreed. Adult Social Care recognises that older people have been under-represented during the pilot of Self Directed Support, and are seeking to address this during Phase One of the implementation, which takes place from April to July 2010. Staff are being encouraged to discuss and promote Self Directed Support with older people, through reviews with existing service users and initial discussions with new service users.

Significant work has already been undertaken in terms of communications around self directed support, including the development of promotional material, and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. This will continue in terms of both universal communications, aimed at all service users, potential service users and the general public, and targeted campaigns aimed at specific groups. One such group will be older people, and staff are currently considering how best this can be achieved, through the use of publications such as the About Leeds paper, and work with a wide range of partners and stakeholders including The Alliance of Service Users and Carers and the

Neighbourhood Networks. The Director of Adult Social Services will provide an update to Scrutiny regarding the strategy and subsequent campaign.

3.10 Recommendation Nine:

The Director of Adult Social Services makes necessary provision to ensure individual support plans clearly identify the short term and emergency back up arrangements should a breakdown in care occur. Arrangements should be stressed and clearly communicated to those in receipt of Self Directed Support and where appropriate to carers and family members.

This recommendation is agreed. The finalised version of the support plan template includes a section entitled 'How I will manage my life/care/budget if things go wrong', which ensures that short term and emergency back up arrangements are clearly identified.

In addition, the support plan policy makes clear that:

"The support plan should also include a costed contingency plan and describe what will happen if an anticipated risk occurs, e.g. a carer being unavailable. Minimum levels of care/ support should be identified together with plans for how these will be met".

Further, guidance for staff and managers states that:

"Support plans will not be agreed unless all identified risks have clear, robust and agreed plans in place to manage those risks, as well as agreed contingency plans".

This management oversight will ensure that any proposed plans are in place and viable. Arrangements and plans will be discussed and agreed with service users, carers and family members prior to the plan being submitted for approval, and copies provided for reference, which will include all contingency measures.

4.0 Implications for Council Policy and Governance

4.1 There are no immediate implications for Council Policy and Governance.

5.0 Legal and Resource Implications

5.1 The recommendations will be resourced from within existing Adult Social Care staffing and budgets, and funding is secured within the approved budget for 2010/11.

6.0 Conclusions

6.1 The Adult Social Care Scrutiny Board inquiry into Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets has identified some important learning for Adult Social Care as it continues to implement the Putting People First agenda. The recommendations it makes will help the service to strengthen practice and enable the Scrutiny Board to monitor progress in this area. The actions proposed in response to these recommendations will ensure that this is the case, and that work with staff and service users relating to Self Directed Support and Personal Budgets is taken forward effectively in the future.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Members are requested to approve the proposed responses as outlined in this report.

Background Papers -There are no specific background papers relating to this report

This page is intentionally left blank