

PROCUREMENT OF VISITING SUPPORT SERVICE FOR OLDER PEOPLE

To: Adults Committee

Meeting Date: 8 March 2018

From: Executive Director, People & Communities

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref: 2018/035 Key decision: Yes

Purpose: To outline the case for re-commissioning the Visiting Support Service.

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to:

- a) ratify the re-commissioning of the Countywide Visiting Support Services under five district based lots for three years, with an option to extend for a further year:**
 - i. three lots (East Cambs, Fenland and Huntingdonshire) via a competitive tender process**
 - ii. two lots (Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire) via co-operation agreements with the district councils**
- b) delegate the sign off of the co-operation agreements with the district councils to the Executive Director, People & Communities in consultation with the Chairwoman and Vice-Chairman of the Adults Committee.**

<i>Officer contact:</i>		<i>Member contacts:</i>	
Name:	Shauna Torrance	Names:	Cllr Bailey/Cllr Howell
Post:	Acting Head of Commissioning	Post:	Chair/Vice-Chair
Email:	Shauna.torrance@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	annabailey@hotmail.co.uk mark.howell@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 714697	Tel:	01223 706398

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Five years ago, following a County Council led review of Older People's Housing Related Support, a strategic decision was made to radically transform the Council's approach to meet current and future challenges. The conclusions of that review were very much in line with the "Transforming Lives" initiative. Although at times challenging, the review benefitted from wide-scale stakeholder involvement, including providers and users of the service.
- 1.2 Prior to April 2014, the housing related support services for older people were only focussed on sheltered housing schemes in the public sector and yet only 5% of older people lived in sheltered housing. While sheltered housing tenants benefit from living in a communal environment with access to support, older people living in the wider community are often isolated with more limited access to services.
- 1.3 The primary aim of the project was to remodel the service, to use the funding more effectively to benefit older people living in Cambridgeshire and to re-distribute funding to address inequality of provision as previously the funding had been ring fenced against sheltered housing schemes.

2.0 HOUSING TENURE

- 2.1 The support service had its origins in sheltered housing and it would be fair to say that it took longer than anticipated to achieve a tenure neutral service i.e. one that was available to all older people including owner occupiers and people privately renting. The services in Fenland, Huntingdonshire and South Cambs have worked particularly hard to promote the support service to owner occupiers and private sector tenants and their current caseloads comprise of 52%, 39% and 26% owner occupiers respectively for these housing tenures. The housing tenure in Cambridgeshire varies across from 49% owner occupiers in Cambridge City to 73% in South Cambs.

3.0 OUTCOMES OF THE SERVICE

- 3.1 This service provides time limited support which is intended to achieve specific outcomes for individuals and once these have been achieved, then people will be signed off the service and the service then moves on to deliver support to other individuals. The service is designed to promote independence and is delivered by support workers who have a high understanding of the specific needs of older people and of local organisations and services within each of the districts. During 2016/17 there were 1,043 departures from the services which equates to an average weekly support cost of £20.53 per person.
- 3.2 In 2016/17 the services were successful in supporting 414 households to maximise their household incomes. This makes a substantial difference to people's lives and means they can self-fund other services to support their independence, which delays and/or prevents access to statutory services.

2016/17	City	East Cambs	Fenland	Hunts	South Cambs	Totals
Attendance Allowance - Low	27	6	47	103	13	196
Attendance Allowance - High	46	22	22	72	25	187
Carers Allowance	0	2	7	6	16	31
AA Low - Annual Value	£78,133	£17,363	£136,009	£298,061	£37,619	£567,185
AA High - Annual Value	£198,775	£95,066	£95,066	£311,126	£108,030	£808,064
Carers Allowance - Annual Value	£0	£6,521	£22,823	£19,562	£52,166	£101,072
TOTAL (Annualised)	£276,908	£118,950	£253,898	£628,750	£197,816	£1,476,322

In addition, 25 people received one-off grants totalling more than £20,000 from a range of sources.

- 3.3 At the time this information was compiled 879 people were being supported by the services and the numbers and age distributions is shown in the table below.

	No. of people	%age split
Under 65	77	9%
Age 65 - 74	279	32%
Age 75 - 84	305	34%
Age 85+	218	25%

Of the 879 people that were being supported, 25% were aged 85 years and older. This age group is much more likely to be frailer and suffer from mobility issues and therefore supporting this group to live independently is helping to reduce and/or delay access to statutory services.

- 3.4 Increasingly, the services are receiving referrals from Discharge Teams to support people to leave hospital. Many have multiple issues, such as poor or inappropriate housing, hoarding issues, no furniture, no access to money etc. Often these people would not be eligible for other services and would be passed around by different agencies. Whilst this might not result in direct savings to the Council, by supporting people to leave hospital the 'whole system benefits'.

4.0 FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS AND PEOPLE USING THE SERVICE

- 4.1 Stakeholders were asked to complete an on-line survey about the services. There was a wide range of responses from professionals as well as those working in the voluntary sector. They were asked to comment on what they thought was working well. Responses included, *"They are responsive and will look at any additional support they can provide, as well as what has been referred for"*, *"very helpful with housing issues"*, *"I have referred older people who need assistance with completing benefit claim forms in their own home...claiming additional benefits has enabling them to access clubs and start to make new friends"*.
- 4.2 Stakeholders were also asked how the service could be improved. A number of stakeholders advised that knowledge around social care services and eligibility criteria could be improved, as well as a more streamline system to feedback on referrals made to the service. Currently each of the services have different names and some stakeholders observed that it would be helpful if the services had one name. This has been incorporated into the procurement process.

- 4.3 Feedback from people using the services is included in the contract monitoring information. The comments about the services are very positive and include, *“I am very pleased with (the service) and my only thought is ‘if only I had contacted you earlier’ when I was in a desperate state, struggling to survive” (Mrs D – Fenland); “I can now shower without fear of falling, I feel more independent as I no longer need help. Now I have extra money, I can pay my daughter-in-law for doing my cleaning and shopping. I can buy my lunches from Wiltshire Foods now” (Mrs G – East Cambs).*

5.0 CONTRACT DETAILS

- 5.1 The services are divided into 5 district based lots. Previously, three of the lots were tendered, as the provider of the services were Housing Associations to which the Council housing stock was transferred. The services in the City and South Cambs services are provided through a Co-operation Agreement. This was as a result of problems with TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings [Protection of Employment] Regulations), as the cost of the staff group declared for TUPE for Cambridge City Council was greater than the budget available for the service. In addition, the City Council were contributing around £100K additional funding from their own resources, on top of the County Council contract value.
- 5.2 LGSS Law advised that “contracts which establish co-operation between public entities with the aim of ensuring that a public task is carried out fall outside the public procurement rules insofar as such contracts are concluded exclusively by public entities and implementation of that co-operation is governed solely by considerations and requirements relating to the pursuit of objectives in the public interest”. Accordingly, the same Co-operation arrangement was offered to South Cambs District Council.
- 5.3 There are criteria that have to be met to comply with the rule. Our advice is that these criteria could be met within the current arrangements and the approach should be used with the City Council and South Cambs District Council.
- 5.4 The total funding for all five services is £1,113,500 per annum.

6.0 ALIGNMENT WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES

Report authors should evaluate the proposal(s) in light of their alignment with the following three Corporate Priorities.

6.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

There are no significant implications for this priority.

6.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

The following set out details of implications identified by officers:

- People are supported to live in their own homes for as long as possible.
- See paragraphs under section 3 and 4.

6.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

The following set out details of implications identified by officers:

- See paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4.

7.0 SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The services are subject to a competitive tender process to ensure that the Council achieves best value.

7.2 Procurement/Contractual/Council Contract Procedure Rules Implications

Tender process has been undertaken in compliance with EU procurement rules.

7.3 Statutory, Legal and Risk Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

7.4 Equality and Diversity Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

7.5 Engagement and Communications Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

7.6 Localism and Local Member Involvement

There are no significant implications within this category.

7.7 Public Health Implications

There are no significant implications within this category.

Implications	Officer Clearance
Have the resource implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Martin Wade
Have the procurement/contractual/ Council Contract Procedure Rules implications been cleared by Finance?	Yes Name of Financial Officer: Paul White
Has the impact on statutory, legal and risk implications been cleared by LGSS Law?	Yes Name of Legal Officer: Duncan Dooley-Robinson
Have the equality and diversity implications been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Oliver Hayward
Have any engagement and communication implications been cleared by Communications?	Yes Name of Officer: Matthew Hall
Have any localism and Local Member involvement issues been cleared by your Service Contact?	Yes Name of Officer: Oliver Hayward
Have any Public Health implications been cleared by Public Health	Yes Name of Officer: Tess Campbell

Source Documents	Location
None	