

**ADULTS COMMITTEE: MINUTES**

- Date:** Wednesday 7 November 2019
- Time:** 2.00 pm to 3.53 pm
- Present:** Councillors A Bailey (Chairwoman), D Connor, A Costello, S Crawford, M Goldsack, N Harrison, M Howell (Vice-Chairman), D Wells and G Wilson.
- Apologies:** Councillors J French (substituted by Councillor D Connor) and Councillor D Giles

**222. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies received from Councillor French, substituted by Councillor Connor and Councillor Giles.

No declarations of interest were received.

**223. MINUTES AND ACTION LOG – 10 OCTOBER 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairwoman. Members noted the completed actions on the action plan.

**224. PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

None received.

**225. CARE HOME DEVELOPMENT**

The Committee received a report that sought approval to launch a tender exercise to put in place a Framework Agreement for continuing to spot purchase care home services.

In introducing the report officers drew the Committees attention to missing text under item 2.3 which should have read;

“Where providers have a rating of Requires Improvement, they will be required to submit an Improvement Plan via the tender process to the council that will be assessed by officers in order for quality assurances to be met. In addition, where homes have received a ‘Requires Improvement’ or ‘Inadequate’ rating more than once in the last 5 years, the council will reserve the right to not award a contract”.

In discussing the report Members:

- Queried how new providers would access the framework. Officers explained that this was detailed at point 2.4 of the report and that in order for new providers to have the ability to enter the Framework Agreement at a later date, it was proposed to open up the tender process approximately every six months, whilst retaining flexibility to account for emerging providers in the market and best use of council resources.
- Questioned the proposed contract length of 10 years. Officers explained that the length was in order that relationships could be established with providers.
- Queried the average length of stay for placements that were spot purchased. Officer clarified that the average stay was 18 months.
- Sought clarity on what would happen if a care home dropped out of good or outstanding status. Officers explained that the Council would work with the provider to develop an action plan. If no improvements were made as a result of the plan then they would seek to terminate the contract.
- Queried why providers were not asked to submit prices for service delivery as detailed at point 2.6 of the report. Officers explained that increasing block contracting was the main way the Council aimed to control the costs. The Committee had reviewed this approach at their last meeting with a rebalancing of contracts to a position of 50% spot contracts and 50% block contracts. Current spot pricing processes would continue with the Brokerage Service negotiating individual placement costs.

It was resolved unanimously to:

1. To seek approval from Committee to launch a tender exercise to put in place a Framework Agreement for continuing to spot purchasing care home services.
2. To seek approval from Committee to delegate authority to award to preferred suppliers to Executive Director, People and Communities.

**226. CAMBRIDGESHIRE & PETERBOROUGH ADULTS SAFEGUARDING PARTNERSHIP BOARDS ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19**

The Committee considered the annual report from the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Adults Safeguarding Board.

In presenting the report officers explained that the report had been streamlined from last year and focused on a number of highlights including;

- The strengthened quality assurance role of the Adults Safeguarding Partnership Board;
- The introduction of self-assessments for agencies in relation to their own practice;
- A focus on engagement with communities including conducting a number of surveys, promoting safeguarding awareness month across both Adults and Children's services and holding a number of roadshows;
- The use of social media reaching 76,725 users during safeguarding awareness month;
- The introduction of a Multi-Agency Risk Management process and;
- The review of the Safeguarding Adults review process using learning from Children's services.

In discussing the report Members:

- Requested that the key performance indicators be included at the front of the report next year in order that the Committee could then clearly review progress against the targets set. **ACTION**
- Questioned what the average number of Safeguarding Reviews was currently. Officers clarified that the current figure had increased from three to five cases. Officers explained that there was a willingness to embrace new ways of working and that some cases that did not necessarily hit the set criteria were now being looked at by the partnership.
- Discussed how the partnership could engage further with vulnerable groups in particular individuals in controlling relationships, and encourage them to report safeguarding issues.
- Queried the criteria in terms of whether there was learning from when deaths had occurred and the individuals were not known by existing agencies. Officers clarified that the Coroner would discuss with the safeguarding team and relevant agencies if there was such a case and learning would be taken from these discussions. If it was a case of domestic homicide, this would be dealt with through the Community Safety Partnership.
- Requested information in the next annual report covering roles and responsibilities of all of the different safeguarding partners. **ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously to receive and note the contents of the 2018/19 Annual Report.

## **227. FINANCE MONITORING REPORT – SEPTEMBER 2019**

The Committee received the September 2019/20 Finance Monitoring report for People and Communities and highlighted the financial position of

services that were under the Committee's responsibility. Officers clarified that at the end of September, Adults services were forecast to overspend by £700k, around 0.4% of the budget. This was an improvement of £394k from August. Within that, budgets relating to care provision were forecast to overspend by £5.4million, mitigated by around £4.7 million of additional funding.

In discussing the report Members:

- Welcomed the Adults budget overview provided in section 3 of the report.
- Queried whether forecasting could be improved on the Learning Disability Partnership budget. Officers explained that this was a relatively static cohort and the forecasting was based on trends and that a small number of high cost packages could change the spend significantly.
- Highlighted the good progress in relation to the savings tracker.
- Queried the status of the Housing Related Support review on the savings tracker. Officers explained that the savings had been rephased and that officers expected the full amount of savings to be delivered. Officers clarified that an update on the review was due to be presented at the next Committee meeting.
- Discussed the forecasting of winter pressures and queried whether assumptions were made. Officers clarified that assumptions were not made above the current trend.
- Congratulated officers on their hard work to ensure that the budget variance was as small as possible.

It was resolved unanimously to review and comment on the report.

## **228. DEEP DIVE - QUALITY OF CARE PROVISION (CARE PROVIDERS)**

The Committee considered a report that provided a detailed update on the current quality of care provision across Cambridgeshire care providers.

In presenting the report officers highlighted that Cambridgeshire had a large footprint of social care providers with 121 care homes with 5,551 beds in total. Contracts were with a range of providers and although capacity of care was sufficient across the county at a global level, there was disparity of provision across rural areas, with key pressures varying across districts. Officers clarified that despite the challenges that had been highlighted, Cambridgeshire was one of the better performing local authorities across the country in terms of Care Quality Commission ratings, with ratings well above the national average with 96% of Cambridgeshire residential care providers rated as good or outstanding compared with 83%

nationally. Officers gave a summary of the day to day proactive contract management support which included:

- Meetings once every two months with partners to discuss providers of concern who were monitored on a weekly basis, highlighting that there were currently 20 providers of concern, which was an average number of providers.
- Attending the providers forum to gain feedback
- Three weekly teleconferences with the Care Quality Commission so that interventions were timed accordingly.

In discussing the report Members:

- Queried whether intelligence from service users and their families was actively encouraged. Officers confirmed that feedback from services users and their families was mainly fed through from the providers themselves as they were required to disclose any complaints that were made through the contract monitoring process. The Chairwoman highlighted the need to proactively seek intelligence as key for the future. Officers explained that when individuals needed to be moved because of concerns in relation to providers then the social work teams worked closely with the brokers and contract teams to ensure the safety of the individuals concerned.
- Sought clarity on the general nature of concerns in relation to providers and whether officers offered support to help the providers and if this was charged for. Officers explained that concerns were varied ranging from minor to major issues and the contracts team offered support to providers to help overcome issues. Providers were not charged for general support but there was provision to charge for extra training to providers. Officers would physically go into the setting working with providers to develop action plans and provide support to improve in line with the plan.
- Questioned how Cambridgeshire benchmarked against others in terms of our level of resources and whether any other authorities recovered these costs.
- Sought further clarity on where intelligence was gathered from in terms of raising safeguarding concerns. Officers reiterated that intelligence came from a number of sources, through providers themselves, through routine contract monitoring, from the Care Quality Commission, through other partners and CCC officers themselves.
- Requested a further update report to Committee in the next year to include mechanisms for Service User feedback. **ACTION**

- Queried the number of 919 Care Workers per 10,000 population and requested further information from officers in relation to what roles this covered in relation to the whole workforce. **ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously note and comment on the contents of the report.

## **229. ADULTS POSITIVE CHALLENGE PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee received a report and presentation on progress to date on the delivery of the Adult Positive Challenge Programme.

In presenting the report officers explained that the Delivery Confidence Assessment for the Programme was assessed as Amber which meant that good progress had been made but that the programme was slightly off track to deliver the full £3.8 million benefits as planned in 19/20. Overall the programme had evidenced a total of £786,000 in Cost Avoidance between April and August 2019. Programme impact was monitored via trajectory approach which included 'top down' care costs combined with 'bottom up' activity and flow trajectories and workstream level benefit tracking. Officers explained they would be seeking feedback from the Committee in due course on how they would like to be kept informed of the programme.

Members discussed the financial trajectory in detail with officers and requested an additional line be added to the trajectory to show how far the programme had got in relation to savings made. **ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously to:

review progress to date on the 19/20 Adult Positive Challenge Programme and use this report to inform consideration of the business case for the 20/21 programme when it is presented to December Committee.

## **230. PEOPLE & COMMUNITIES RISK REGISTER**

The Committee received the annual update of the current People and Communities Risk Register.

In presenting the report officers explained that the report highlighted the key strategic risks of the directorate and also included the Brexit Impact Assessment that had been developed across the authority. Officers clarified that the authority had a risk tolerance level of 16 and all risks were reviewed on a monthly basis by the People and Communities Management team. Risks were then escalated to the Council's Senior Management team whenever a significant risk was identified.

Members discussed the Brexit Impact Assessment briefly but noted that they were unable to have a full discussion on the assessment due to being

in purdah for the General Election. Members requested that the naming of the first Brexit risk should be renamed to 'Community Relations'. **ACTION**

Members concluded that the Brexit Impact Assessment should come back to Committee in December so that it could be discussed further. **ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously to note and comment on the People and Communities risk register.

**231. AGENDA PLAN, APPOINTMENTS AND TRAINING PLAN**

Members queried when they would receive an update on Winter Pressures. Officers clarified that they would circulate an update to the Committee. **ACTION**

Members queried why they had not been receiving the regular dashboard updates on Delayed Transfers of Care. Officers explained that they would look into this and ensure updates were circulated. **ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously to:

note the Agenda Plan and the Training Plan.

**232. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

It was resolved unanimously:

that the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the agenda contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

**233. LEARNING DISABILITY PARTNERSHIP - BASELINE 2020/21 (POOLED BUDGET REVIEW)**

The Committee received a report on the Learning Disability Partnership – Baseline 2020/21 (Pooled Budget Review).

Members discussed the report and requested updates on progress. **ACTION**

It was resolved unanimously to:

consider the content of this report and approve.

**234. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Chairwoman clarified that the next Committee meeting had been moved from 12 December to 18 December due to the General Election.

**Chairwoman**