

ADULTS COMMITTEE: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday 4th December 2014

Time: 2.00p.m. to 4.35p.m.

Present: Councillors P Ashcroft, A Bailey (Vice-Chairwoman), D Divine (substituting for Councillor Tew), D Giles, G Kenney, M Loynes, L Nethsingha, F Onasanya, K Reynolds, S Rylance (Chairwoman), J Scutt (substituting for Councillor Crawford), M Smith, G Wilson, and F Yeulett.

Apologies: Councillors K Bourke, S Crawford, and M Tew

A minute's silence was held in memory of Councillor John Reynolds.

54. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wilson declared a statutory disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct in relation to Minute 62 "Adult Social Care Services Commissioned From Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust", as his wife was a Specialist Health Visitor employed by Cambridgeshire Community Services (CCS). He therefore left the meeting and took no part in the discussion on this item.

55. MINUTES – 4TH NOVEMBER 2014

The minutes of the meeting held on 4th November 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman.

56. PETITIONS

No petitions were received.

57. ADULT SOCIAL CARE – TRANSPORT POLICY PROPOSAL

A report was received by the Committee regarding the proposed Adult Social Care Transport Policy. The policy was designed to provide clarity to members of staff and Service Users on the rationale of decision making regarding transport provision. The Committee was requested to approve a three month consultation because of the breadth of stake-holders and interested parties that would want to take part.

At the discretion of the Chairwoman, County Councillor Van de Ven was invited to address the Committee. She raised concerns over the Impact Assessment as there was no previous policy to judge it against. She questioned the links between the policy presented and the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Policy, whether Age UK provided

transport and the Dial-a-Ride costs. She also requested that user groups were involved in the initial scoping of the policy.

Beth McCabe of the Cambridgeshire Alliance for Independent Living was invited to address the Committee at the discretion of the Chairwoman. She expressed disappointment that the group she represents was not involved earlier. She expressed concerns over the impact assessment and questioned to what extent the policy would affect an individual's support plan, and could the cost of the transport be a barrier to people accessing services.

Officers advised that the Impact Assessments were a working document that covered a wide range of Service User groups and the difficulties they experienced. Officers confirmed that contact had been made with officer leads working on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment who would be looking to incorporate the Cambridgeshire Future Transport Policy.

During discussion Members commented that:

- options for community transport were decreasing and would put further strain upon the Local Authority. Officers advised the Committee that the policy determined eligibility for transport. While issues for accessing transport were accepted, it was not the purpose of the policy to tackle that issue.
- people with HIV/Aids should be included within the policy because with proper treatment the outlook was good. Officers explained to the Committee that the reason for listing specific Service User groups was to align the policy with care teams.
- there needed to be clarification as to whether the policy represented a levelling up or levelling down of the current position and if there were people who currently received transport but would not in the future as a result of the policy. It was explained by officers that the policy represented the best practice in order for open and honest conversations to take place that determined the level of transport assistance individuals needed. It provided a framework for members of staff and the public.
- they were shocked that people were abused on public transport. Officers advised that regrettably abuse of passengers on public transport, particularly of the Learning Disabled, did take place but that it was being tackled in partnership with the Police and bus companies.

It was resolved unanimously:

- a) To take note of the report and make comments in relation to it.
- b) To approve a three month consultation on the proposed Transport Policy for Adult Social Care.

58. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER UPDATE

The Committee received a report that provided an update regarding the Children's, Families and Adults (CFA) Corporate Risk Register. The Committee was informed that in line with best practice the Council operated a risk management approach at corporate and directorate levels across the Council seeking to identify any risks which might prevent the Council's priorities, as stated in the Business Plan and in service plans, from being successfully achieved.

Having discussed the contents of the report Members:

- highlighted that it had been requested for a risk to be added to the register and it was unclear whether it had been added. Officers advised that they would check to ensure it had been. **ACTION**
- asked whether the passing of a target date meant it had been delivered. Officers confirmed that if a target date had passed it meant it had been delivered.
- asked whether there were any risks that were giving significant cause for concern. Officers advised that having the capacity to respond to demand for services was the greatest concern.
- questioned whether risk 13, regarding care homes being unable to accept Local Authority funded residents should be higher than a rating of 12. Officers confirmed that a rating of 12 was high and there were a number of homes that had received adverse Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspections which increased the risk in this area. Officers explained that it was becoming more challenging to procure care at an affordable price particularly for nursing dementia beds.
- queried if there were any trends shown in the report. Officers explained that the overall financial position of the Council resulted in access to services becoming more difficult. However, Reablement services had mitigated some of the impact and activity rates had remained static. The demography of the county was resulting in an increased risk.
- asked how the Council compared with other Local Authorities. Officers advised the Committee that it was not possible to make comparisons with other Local Authorities because the way in which they measured risk would be different. However, officers confirmed that Cambridgeshire was a higher risk county due to demography and demand for services.

It was resolved unanimously:

To consider the risk register and the actions being taken to mitigate the risks.

59. REVIEW OF INTERIM AND RESPITE BEDS

A report was presented to the Committee that reviewed the provision of Interim and Respite beds in Cambridgeshire. The report was written in order to better understand the usage of respite and interim beds across the county and whether the current provision was cost effective and produced the outcomes desired.

Mr Murphy of the Huntingdonshire Clinical Commissioning Group was invited at the discretion of the Chairwoman to address the Committee and highlighted the pressures acute hospitals found themselves under and how they relied on interim beds. Mr Murphy explained that it was difficult to delineate health and social care needs. While he acknowledged the financial position, he questioned whether the impact of the proposals was fully understood and explained that if the proposals were agreed, an urgent thorough impact assessment and plan would be required to mitigate the effects of the decision.

Members of the Committee considered the report and commented:

- that they were concerned about the effect the proposals would have upon delayed discharge and the number of operations completed. Officers explained that the proposals did not aim to reduce the number of beds but ensure that beds were funded correctly.
- that the County Council could not sustain the funding of the interim beds. Officers advised that the proposals were contained within the Business Planning report agreed at the last meeting of the Committee. Fines were being levied by Hinchingbrooke Hospital for patients who were delayed in their transfer from hospital for social care reasons and this was unsustainable for the Council.
- on why there was over provision in Huntingdonshire when there was a countywide approach to commissioning. It was explained that commissioning was carried out on a countywide basis however,
- that there was a danger that the proposals could be seen as cost shifting from the Council to the NHS and that it would be resisted by the NHS. Officers advised that the proposals were designed to tackle an historical issue that had arisen from when budgets between the Council and NHS were pooled. Officers emphasised that the Council was being fined because beds were blocked by people who should have been funded by the NHS.
- whether recommendation “e” represented a cut. Officers responded by advising the Committee that efficiency was tied up with bed utilisation rates and the current model did not fit the need.
- whether there was a way through the Brokerage Team for people who pay for their own care to make use of available beds so that the optimum use of beds occurred. Officers advised that under current respite arrangements, self-funding residents were unable to purchase a period of respite through the Council however this would change in the future. Officers explained that the current model of respite offered by the Council needed to be updated with many people preferring to receive respite in their own homes, which was an area where respite would be developed in the future.

It was resolved to:

- a) work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to alter the current balance of Local Authority and NHS commissioned beds.

- b) reduce the current residential respite block contract to open up other options for respite care and support.
- c) address the geographical imbalance in the provision of interim and respite beds.
- d) commission respite nursing (home) dementia provision to meet identified need.
- e) deliver efficiency savings of £270k from interim care and £120k from respite care in 2015/16.

60. TIMEBANKING IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE: AN EXAMPLE OF DEVELOPING COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

The Committee was received a report on Timebanking in Cambridgeshire. The report provided an update on the development of Timebanking across the county, including Cambridgeshire County Council's role in facilitating growth of the network. The Committee was also asked to consider the future development of Timebanking and how learning from the experience could inform the Council's approach to Community Resilience.

Members of the Committee welcomed the report and commented:

- on the positive benefits of the scheme.
- that Members would be keen to go to Parish and Town Councils to help promote the scheme.
- how the scheme complemented the Community Navigators Scheme. Officers advised Members of the Committee that Timebanking was an exchange of time whereas Community Navigators signposted people to the correct places; however, they both work together and connected well.
- that they would be interested in seeing the presentation and requested that it was sent round to Members of the Committee. **ACTION**

It was resolved to:

- a) Note progress and achievements to date.
- b) Comment on the plans for future development.
- c) Consider and advise upon the most effective way to involve Members and any support that was needed for Members to help take this type of development forward in their division.

61. CAMBRIDGESHIRE LOCAL ASSISTANCE SCHEME (CLAS) – FUTURE OPTIONS

A report was presented to the Committee that presented a range of options on the future development of the Cambridgeshire Local Assistance Scheme (CLAS) based on an understanding of current use and need for the scheme, and subject to final decisions being made about the amount of funding available. Having discussed the contents of the report Members:

- asked whether it was possible for white goods disposed of at recycling centres to be refurbished and utilised for the scheme. Officers explained that it might not be cost effective because when they were left at recycling centres they became the property of the contractor and the costs associated with refurbishing were high.
- highlighted that a main trigger for the need for CLAS was personal debt and asked whether Credit Unions were being utilised effectively. Officers advised that Housing Associations and Credit Unions were helpful around debt issues and they were looking to be included in the process.
- expressed concerns that there was lack of awareness of the scheme amongst professionals and that it was essential that equal take up of the scheme across the County occurred.

Councillor Bailey proposed an amendment to recommendation “a” to consider options 5 and 6 for the future of CLAS due to the uncertainty of the future of funding from central government, seconded by Councillor Yeulett. On being put the vote, the amendment was carried.

It was resolved to;

- a) Agree the options 5 and 6 for development of CLAS pending a final decision with regard to the amount of funding available.
- b) Agree that officers develop a final option for agreement by the Committee in February 2015 once the funding situation became settled.
- c) Support further discussions on the possibility of funding CLAS through financial contributions from individual partner organisations.

62. ADULT SOCIAL CARE SERVICES COMMISSIONED FROM CAMBRIDGESHIRE COMMUNITY SERVICES NHS TRUST

The Committee received a report regarding the outcome of negotiations with Uniting Care Partnership, concerning the transfer of social care services which the Council funded from the current provider, Cambridgeshire Community Services NHS Trust. Officers informed the Committee that agreement had been reached with Uniting Care Partnership.

Members of the Committee welcomed the agreement with Uniting Care Partnership and considered the report, commenting:

- that there were implications for Peterborough identified by officers and questioned what these were. Officers advised that an understanding needed to be gained of what was provided by Peterborough but it was understood that it was small.
- that changes to staffing with employees moving from the NHS to the Council represented a positive change.
- that it was essential that the contracts were the same. Officers confirmed that Occupational Therapy services would be managed by a new provider. Officers advised that there had been a challenge around statistical information with clear management information being required. This was currently being discussed and developed.

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the negotiated plan which involved the following changes to take place by 1st April 2015:

- a) The transfer of Occupational Therapy Services to Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Foundation Trust.
- b) The transfer of the Assistive Technology Team to Cambridgeshire County Council.
- c) The establishment of a contract with Uniting Care Partnership to deliver Assistive Technology and Telehealth across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.
- d) The transfer of Reablement services to Cambridgeshire County Council.

63. PHYSICAL DISABILITY AND SENSORY SERVICES COMMISSIONING STRATEGY

A report was presented to the Committee that provided a draft strategy for the commissioning of services by the Physical Disabilities (PD) and Sensory Services (SS) Teams. Background and context about the PD and SS teams was provided by officers to Members of the Committee. Officers advised that the Commissioning Strategy needed to be updated because of the challenges facing the Local Authority. It was highlighted to the Committee that the PD team had already begun to redesign the service to align with the work completed with Transforming Lives.

Following discussion of the report Members:

- requested that they would like to see the final draft of the strategy following the consultation in order for Members to agree it. Officers advised the Committee that the final draft of the strategy would be brought back to the Committee for comment.
- raised a question over what level of consultation was being undertaken with people receiving care services. It was explained by officers that the PD and SS Partnership Board had been included through the process. The Board had membership from carers, Service Users and key stakeholders.
- requested to understand more about Community Navigators. Officers informed the Committee that it was a scheme managing Care Networks. There were currently 5 coordinators who recruited volunteers to become Community Navigators. Police

Community Support Officers (PCSOs) and some housing workers were currently Community Navigators.

- asked what officers believed the greatest challenge was facing the PD and SS teams. Officers advised that developing the community and local resources was the biggest challenge.
- questioned how the strategy related to the Transport Policy proposal discussed earlier in the meeting. Officers explained that the strategy needed to be reviewed once the Transport Policy was in place. The Transport Policy was not referred to because it had not yet been formally agreed.
- requested an executive summary of the strategy. Officers advised that an executive summary would be produced once the strategy had been finalised.

The Chairwoman proposed an amendment to recommendation “b” for the final draft to be presented to the Committee at a future meeting. Members agreed unanimously to the proposal.

It was resolved to:

- a) Take note of and comment on the draft Physical Disability and Sensory Services Commissioning Strategy that would be consulted on through the Physical Disability and Sensory Services Partnership Board.
- b) Agree to receive the final draft strategy at a future meeting of the Adults Committee.

64. DEVELOPING AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM FOR CAMBRIDGESHIRE TO IMPROVE OUTCOMES FOR OLDER PEOPLE

A report was presented to the Committee to provide a summary of the discussions that had taken place across the public, voluntary and community sector in Cambridgeshire over the last year regarding how a more integrated system could be developed so that outcomes for older people were improved. The report built on the recently agreed Older People’s Strategy and formed a basis for the development of a joint programme plan for the Cambridgeshire Executive Partnership Board (CEPB) and with the new NHS provider, Uniting Care Partnership (UCP).

Committee Members considered the report and commented:

- that it was positive to see firm proposals but wondered how governance was proposed to work. Officers informed the Committee that the CEPB was positive about the work being carried out and the UCP had agreed that this reflected their model. It was accepted that the challenges would appear when detailed implementation takes place.

whether the Chairwoman and Vice-Chairwoman were allocated a place on the CEPB. Officers advised the Committee that the CEPB was an officer board. It was explained

that each organisation would have to follow its respective governance structure and therefore Members attending would not be appropriate

- that it would be helpful for there to be one unique identification number for patients as it would improve information sharing between organisations. Officers informed the Committee that NHS identification numbers were increasingly being used within Adult Social Care but there was more work to do in this area.

The Chairwoman proposed an amendment to recommendation “a” to request the Better Care Fund Working Group to lead the work of the Committee on the move from agreement to the implementation of an integrated system across Cambridgeshire to improve outcomes for older people, alongside the (CEPB). This was agreed unanimously by the Committee.

It was resolved to:

- a) Consider and endorse the 10 key features of an integrated system to improve outcomes for older people, set out in section 2.2 of the report.
- b) To request the Better Care Fund Working Group to lead the work of the Committee on the move from agreement to the implementation of an integrated system across Cambridgeshire to improve outcomes for older people, alongside the Cambridgeshire Executive Partnership Board (CEPB)

65. ADULTS COMMITTEE REVIEW OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO 2015/16 BUSINESS PLANNING PROPOSALS FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE, OLDER PEOPLE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Following the General Purposes Committee’s (GPC) decision to allocate an additional £2.5 million to Children, Families and Adults (CFA), a report was presented to the Committee that demonstrated how the additional funds would be utilised. Officers informed the Committee that the additional money had been deployed to reduce some of the risks regarding some of the savings proposals. The timing of savings had also been looked at and some had been moved back in order to mitigate risk. Officers also informed the Committee that £300,000 had been made available by the GPC from the Public Health budget for falls prevention that would be targeted to those most at risk.

Members of the Committee discussed the report and commented:

- that there were 3 Key Performance Indicators for Reablement and whether this was too many. Officers explained that they were designed to measure the impact of Reablement against specific client groups.
- that the Key Performance Indicators be brought back to a future meeting in order to be discussed further. Members felt that they were lacking target information. Following a focussed Better Care Fund (BCF) bid it was felt that falls prevention would be able to be measured. Officers agreed to bring the Key Performance Indicators back to a future meeting of the Committee with targets proposed. Officers

agreed they would look at how the impact of the BCF was measured and provide a report.

It was resolved to:

- a) Note the update on the Council's overall financial position.
- b) Note the remaining milestones in the Business Planning process.
- c) Agree the use of additional funding allocated by the General Purposes Committee on 2nd December 2014.
- d) Note the further detail on the performance indicators for the Business Plan 2015/16 and agree for them to be brought back to a future Committee for further comment.

66. ADULTS COMMITTEE AGENDA PLAN

The Committee was asked to review its agenda plan.

It was resolved to note the agenda plan.

Chairwoman