

## **Lancashire County Council**

### **Scrutiny Committee**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 16th December, 2016 at 10.00 am in Cabinet Room 'B' - The Diamond Jubilee Room, County Hall, Preston**

#### **Present:**

County Councillor Bill Winlow (Chair)

#### **County Councillors**

A Barnes	R Shewan
Ms L Collinge	V Taylor
Mrs F Craig-Wilson	D Watts
C Crompton	G Wilkins
D O'Toole	B Yates
Mrs L Oades	

County Councillor Fabian Craig-Wilson replaced County Councillor John Shedwick for this meeting.

#### **1. Apologies**

None were received.

#### **2. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Interests**

None were disclosed.

#### **3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 November 2016**

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

#### **4. Newton Europe Update**

The Chair welcomed the following officers to present the item:

- Tony Pounder, Director of Adult Services
- Neil Kissock, Director of Financial Resources
- Stephen Knight, Associate Director Newton Europe Consultants
- Louise Taylor, Corporate Director Operations and Delivery.

In June the Scrutiny Committee received a presentation from Newton Europe which provided the Committee with an overview of how the role and remit of Newton's was contributing to the transformation of the design and delivery of services which would result in improved outcomes for adults. It was agreed that further updates would be provided to inform Members on the progress being made.

Newton Europe had been working with LCC on a major change programme called "Passport to Independence". Its aim was to help people stay healthy and independent for longer whilst improving practice and process which would lead to better outcomes for service users and overall financial savings. There are 4 main aims of the programme:

- Promoting Wellbeing – this was working at the Community and Acute entry point to Adult Social Care to maximise usage of non-statutory services.
- Promote and Support Independence – this project sought to promote independence through community assessments and reviews. Achieving this required improvements to the decision making practice within these teams, whilst also increasing the team productivity.
- Reablement – this increased both the capacity of reablement and the independent outcomes people achieved through improved ways of working with providers.
- Ordinary Lives – this was building on the potential of people with learning disabilities to enjoy an ordinary life.

The overall approach of work with Newton Europe was divided into 3 areas

- Assessment – where were the biggest opportunities for improvement
- Design – what were the solutions and how did we know they worked
- Implementation and Sustainability – rolling out solutions that supported practice transformation across the County, locality by locality.

The presentation, which is appended to the minutes, went on to identify what had been achieved during the Design phase and what the wider system and partner benefits were.

Several examples were given of how different ways of working produced positive benefits for service users which included:

- The number of people going into long term residential care had halved. From the Acute pathway alone this would lead to more than 250 fewer residential placements per year. The proportion of people going back to their own home directly from hospital went up by 25%.
- The number of hours saved every year for community teams was a result of the screening service being able to solve more cases themselves. Teams increased the number of social care assessments and reviews by 91%.

- More than 80% service users were receiving reablement within existing commissioning capacity and 13% more of reablement customers were fully reabled.

It was paramount to ensure that the results of the review were sustainable. Once the criteria from the results of the review were met the Director of Adult Social Services had the authority to start a measurement period. During this period

- Performance would be tracked weekly over a 3 month period with reduced levels of Newton support
- Ways of work would be monitored to ensure they remain
- The financial benefit delivered during this time would be what counted towards the Programme Contingent Fee Arrangement.

A financial update was also provided by Neil Kissock which explained the benefits, commercial model and costs of the programme and included:

- Information on the KPI equations generated jointly with LCC and Newton detailing how savings will be calculated
- The annualised benefit of each area of the programme identifying both the target and stretch (maximum) savings
- The contract model upon which the fee structure for Newton Europe is based.

Questions and comments by the Committee in relation to the report were as follows:

- It was pointed out to Committee that if people were self-funders it was up to them where they went to receive care. If however, they were looking for a local authority to provide support they could negotiate with LCC where they moved to. LCC would then pay the going rate that whichever local authority would pay within that area. LCC still kept track of people who had moved out of the area as it had responsibility in terms of funding and accountability.
- In terms of care packages, if someone went into hospital, the hospital would alert LCC if it felt this person needed a care assessment. This triggers off a process which meant LCC allocated social workers or social care support officers who would then conduct care assessments. Where LCC needed to fund the care it made arrangements with care agencies, either for residential or domiciliary care.
- Members enquired what the projection of need was in Lancashire over the next ten years or so. A number of factors were looked at in terms of projections around demands in Adult Social Care. At the moment there was a medium term financial strategy which went up to 2020/2021, that was reported to Cabinet on a quarterly basis. This strategy reflected an increase in demands of services in terms of population. There was a significant increase in the ageing population of around 2 – 3% each year.

- The question was raised regarding what sort of fall off in performance there would be when the change programme was rolled out in a wider scale. The Committee was informed that performance in the pilot scheme had been exceptional. All areas of the programme had been benchmarked against similar programmes in other authorities in terms of what was achieved across the whole county implementation.
- Members pointed out that previously there had been delays on referrals for occupational therapy and enquired if these delays had been eradicated. At the moment the Committee was informed that these delays had not been eradicated. At the beginning of the financial year 20 occupational therapy posts had been established. 14 of these were employed on a full time basis. The establishment had increased to 40 occupational therapists. There were different levels of improvement in different areas of the county. Occupational therapists (OTs) had a number of different roles. In some areas the waiting time for equipment had improved.
- The Committee asked how much hospital OTs were relied upon to give advice. The prescriptions of hospital OTs regarding equipment and help people could get at home were entirely accepted. It was vital to have a joined up approach to decision making to make sure people got the right equipment and help.
- Regarding social work and social care services 80% of staff were maintained over the holiday periods.. Money had also been made available to increase crisis hours. LCC was working with Newton Europe to make itself more efficient and cost effective but it could not assume that the whole system would work more effectively..
- Regarding finances, if the savings went above £30 million. Newton Europe would get an additional one off payment of one third of the additional amount.
- The work done around the Statutory Services Review identified that LCC had potentially a financial strategy agreed on the basis of lower quartile costs against its services. On this basis there were additional savings that would be deliverable of around £37 million on Adult Social Care.
- It was felt that it was cheaper for people to stay at home if domiciliary care was provided rather than go into residential care and there was a request for an update to see how many people looked after could be cared for at home. LCC was aiming to support as many people at home as possible. The Committee was informed that a Bite Size Briefing for Councillors on Residential Care was taking place on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2017.
- Information on the amount of funds LCC had lost each year since 2010 would be circulated to Members

- It was stated that there was a crisis around the whole country regarding Adult Social Care. It was felt individual councils could not solve the problem, it had to be an issue for Government.

**Resolved:**

1. The Committee note, comment and express concerns on the Newton Europe update
2. A further update from Newton Europe come to April 2017 meeting of the Scrutiny Committee

**5. Lancashire Safeguarding Adults Board - Annual Report 2015/16**

The Chair welcomed Jane Booth, Independent Chair of the LSAB/LSCB, to the meeting. Jane presented a report on the Lancashire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2015-16.

Lancashire County Council was a lead member agency of Lancashire Safeguarding Adults Board (LSAB). The LSAB had to produce and publish an Annual Report. The draft report for 2015-16 was presented to the Scrutiny Executive prior to publication in September and the final version was now being formally presented to the full Scrutiny Committee together with an update on the work the LSAB had completed in the interim.

The main body of the report was written by the previous Chair of the Board, who resigned earlier in 2016. Interim arrangements were made for the Chair of the Children's Safeguarding Board to also chair the LSAB and this had now been confirmed up to March 2018.

The report drew attention to the impact of changes in legislation which had put the Board on a statutory footing; it provided a brief local context and information about the Board's priorities in 2015-16, together with analysis of data, it reported on coordination and collaboration between services and drew conclusions re adult safeguarding. The report concluded with a review of news during the year which highlighted issues in safeguarding.

What was clear from the report was that adult safeguarding was challenging. Adult vulnerability was complex. The demographic profile of the community would continue to include increasing numbers of people who fell into service user groups more vulnerable to risk of abuse or neglect (including self-neglect) because of their health or social care needs or issues of mental capacity, abuse and neglect. The challenge for agencies in making a proportionate response to safeguarding issues was increased by reducing resources for all services.

The change in the statutory basis of the LSAB and the establishment of a joint business support unit with the Children's Board had enabled the Board to be more pro-active, to develop a formal business plan, and to develop effective sub-groups to deliver the plan. The main body of the report reflected on work completed since April 2016 or currently in progress; there was much being done and more to do. The busy agenda was only made manageable through the commitment of the LSAB members and its business unit.

Questions and comments by the Committee in relation to the report were as follows:

- There were concerns about delays in processing referrals and in dealing with assessments linked to deprivation of liberty safeguards. Members stated that these were unacceptable. The issues around deprivation of liberty safeguards were not just a Lancashire problem but a national problem. The reality was that it had become a much greater workload. More resources had been put into it but it was still difficult to manage. There was a law commission piece of work going on to pull the legislation back into a sensible position that could be made sense of. The people who were at most risk in not having these procedures followed had to be prioritised such as those who had an End of Life Care Plan
- Regarding the guidance on self-neglect, Members enquired if the people of Lancashire were at risk as the guidance felt a bit weak. They were informed that work was being done on the self-neglect policies and procedures. Self-neglect was a new area introduced to safeguarding arena by the Care Act 2014.
- All agencies were brought together in April 2016 looking at how to make safeguarding personal. Safeguarding was embedded in Social Care but LCC was struggling to reach everybody in the care and health network. The Safeguarding Board knew there was a lot of work to do and had to be proportionate about it. There was no lack of commitment with the agencies and a lot of training was being rolled out.
- It was noted that there was no representatives from the prison service or probation service at Board meetings. It was pointed out there had been better attendance in the current financial year from the probation service. Also there were two representatives from the prison service who wished to be on the Safeguarding Board. The Board recognised that prisons were now housing more elderly people who were becoming increasingly reliant on other prisoners.

**Resolved:** Scrutiny Committee considered the content of the Annual Report and the more recent work of the Board and identified any areas it may wish to comment on and any action it may wish to take.

## **6. Work Plan and Task Group Update**

The Work Plan was presented to the Committee regarding upcoming topics and future topics not yet scheduled as well as an update on ongoing Task Groups.

At the January meeting of Scrutiny there would be a presentation from West Lancashire Scrutiny Panel on the Market Town Strategy for Ormskirk. The Skills Agenda would be presented at the February Scrutiny meeting.

Members were informed that the TAMP would come to Scrutiny Committee at least annually for an update and there would also be an annual workshop for district partners to update them on the progress of the TAMP.

Members also discussed the possibility of having a report on the impact of the council's transformation plans on staff at a future meeting.

The Budget Scrutiny Work Group was meeting again on the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

**Resolved:** The Committee approved the 2016/17 work plan.

## **7. Urgent Business**

There were no items of Urgent Business.

## **8. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Scrutiny Committee will take place on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 10.00am in Cabinet Room B (The Diamond Jubilee Room) at the County Hall, Preston.

I Young  
Director of Governance, Finance  
and Public Services

County Hall  
Preston