

3rd March 2014**Agenda Item: 7****REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE,
HEALTH AND PUBLIC PROTECTION****OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION ON THE MODEL FOR ADULT SOCIAL
CARE IN NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND USE OF RESOURCES POLICY****Purpose of the Report**

1. To report to Committee on the outcome of the public consultation undertaken on the model for adult social care in Nottinghamshire and the Use of Resources Policy that supports implementation of the model.
2. To seek agreement to the changes made to the model further to the consultation to make the intentions of the Council clearer.
3. To seek agreement for the model to be renamed as the Adult Social Care Strategy and to be submitted to Full Council for approval and implementation.

Information and Advice

4. The Adult Social Care and Health Committee approved the decision to undertake a public consultation on the model for adult social care and the Use of Resources Policy on 9 September 2013. The proposed model was discussed with staff at the Senior Leadership Team road shows between 25 September and 31 October 2013. The public consultation started on 22 October 2013 and was intended to finish on 20 December, but was subsequently extended until 17 January 2014 to encourage a greater response and to align with the budget challenge consultation. The consultation documents were published on the public website, along with an electronic survey for respondents to complete. A link to this was included on the department's home page on the intranet for staff. The consultation documents were also sent by post or email to:
 - all Nottinghamshire MPs
 - all County Councillors
 - all District and Borough Councils
 - all Parish Councils
 - Citizens Panel
 - Healthwatch

- NAVO – the Nottinghamshire County Council link was posted onto NAVO's website and sent to everyone on NAVO's mailing list
 - all libraries in Nottinghamshire (with 60 ballot boxes)
 - Nottinghamshire Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs)
 - Nottinghamshire NHS Provider Trusts
 - Nottinghamshire Care Homes Association
 - Carers Federation
 - Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Adults Board
 - all managers in the Adult Social Care, Health and Public Protection Department.
5. On review in early December returns suggested that the Council did not have many responses from service users, so letters and survey questions were sent out to a sample of 300 people identified through Framework. Concerns were raised by one service provider that the letters were sent out too close to Christmas.
6. In total 133 responses have been received, although responses are still awaited from some libraries. The profile of respondents was as follows:
- 92 respondents gave their age and out of these 43 (46.7%) were over 65.
 - 87 people gave their ethnic origin and 85 of these (97.7%) described themselves as White British
 - 91 people answered the question about whether they were disabled and out of these 56 (61.5%) indicated that they were
7. Respondents were asked to indicate if they used services or not, or if they worked for the Council or for another organisation. Not all respondents completed these questions, but of those that did responses came from:
- 54 members of the public – defined as people who do not get a service from the Council, but some of whom were caring for dependent relatives
 - 34 service users – defined as people who do get a service from the Council
 - 18 members of staff
 - 20 organisations, including Parish Councils, NHS and voluntary organisations.
8. All the paper responses have now been added to the electronic survey data so that the results could be analysed more easily. A file of the paper copies has been kept for reference. The response rate was quite low but the majority of responses had consistent themes. Some respondents were clearly aware of the budget challenge facing the Council, but were concerned that the new model might mean a lack of choice and control for vulnerable people in Nottinghamshire.
9. The main themes raised in the consultation are set out below:

- **The quality of the documents and the type of consultation undertaken.** Some members of the public questioned the language used in the model and what it means (eg. 'wellbeing' and 'resilience'). Other responses expressed concern about the questionnaire used and the information provided, which they felt was insufficient for people to provide a full and informed response. One Parish Council commented that they felt the consultation was not being given enough time and attention by Council officers and Members.
- **Loss of choice and control for people needing social care support.** A number of respondents expressed concerns about the impact of the proposed model and associated policy on the quality of people's lives. Respondents expressed concern for those who are unable to speak out for themselves and a voluntary organisation commented that people's choice may be compromised by the proposals.
- **An anticipated increase in the pressure on carers.** The possibility of the model putting more pressure on carers was raised by a number of respondents. A member of staff commented that the model might make it more difficult for carers to sustain the level of support they currently provide and that this may lead to further pressure on Council services.
- **The perceived loss of face to face assessments.** The questionnaire posed two questions related to assessments.

Consultation question 1: Do you agree or disagree that the Council should make more use of phone, online and clinic appointments, rather than meeting people face to face?

Out of 124 responses, 75 disagreed with this proposal, 33 agreed and 16 gave no answer or a neutral response (neither agreed nor disagreed). Respondents felt that face to face assessments are essential for some vulnerable people, particularly those that are isolated or hard of hearing and there were concerns about some people being able to present an accurate picture of their needs on the phone. Respondents highlighted the need for experienced staff, local services and a robust Customer Service Centre.

Consultation question 2: Do you agree or disagree that Council staff should only undertake home assessment visits and reviews where the level of risk and need suggests that this is necessary?

In contrast to question 1, out of 123 responses 49 disagreed with this proposal and 60 agreed. 14 gave no answer or a neutral response (neither agreed nor disagreed). A number of respondents raised concerns about who decides what the level of risk is that requires a face to face assessment.

- **Concern about the availability of preventative services.** Respondents, predominantly staff, said they wanted more and current information about services that could reduce the need for care support, and raised some concerns about the quantity of preventative services available.

- **Difficulty with assessing and monitoring the impact of the model.** Finally, respondents wanted to know how the impact of changes would be monitored and whether there would be an appeals process. One Parish Council also highlighted the need for more information on the costs of the proposed model.

10. In response to some of the issues raised in the consultation, work has been undertaken on the model to ensure the Council's intentions are clearer, particularly in relation to:

- identifying how risk will be assessed and the circumstances in which a face to face assessment will be offered
- how support will be targeted at people in order to prevent, reduce or delay need for services in future
- how the needs of individuals will be taken into account, whilst ensuring that the Council achieves best value for money

11. The revised model is attached as appendix 1. The model that went out to consultation can be found in the background papers to this report for the purpose of comparison.

12. In order to assist with clarification, and implementation with staff it is proposed that the model becomes known as the Adult Social Care Strategy and is supported by detailed staff guidance, which is currently being worked on, and will be presented in a training programme for staff which will involve input from senior managers.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

13. It is important for the Council to produce clear information for service users and the public and clear guidance for staff, about how its resources will be prioritised and allocated, in the context of increasing demand, changes to legislation and reduced funding.

Statutory and Policy Implications

14. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Implications for Service Users

15. Once approved the strategy, and supporting guidance for staff, will clarify what the Council is able to provide for service users and carers.

Financial Implications and Human Resources Implications

16. The strategy and guidance will clarify how the Council will allocate its financial and human resources in the future, to meet identified priorities in the most cost effective way. In relation to charging for services, people are already financially assessed and asked to contribute to their care subject to national charging criteria and this will continue to be the case.

Public Sector Equality Duty Implications

17. The original Equality Impact Assessment has been reviewed and updated further to the consultation. It is contained in the list of background papers.

RECOMMENDATION/S

It is recommended that the Adult Social Care and Health Committee:

- 1) Notes the outcomes of the consultation on the model for adult social care and the Use of Resources Policy.
- 2) Agrees the changes made to the model further to the consultation to make the intentions of the Council clearer.
- 3) Agrees that the model is renamed as the Adult Social Care Strategy and submitted to Full Council for approval and implementation.

DAVID PEARSON

Corporate Director, Adult Social Care, Health and Public Protection

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Sarah Hampton

Commissioning Officer

Email: sarah.hampton@nottsc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments (KK 12/02/2014)

18. The proposals in this report are within the remit of the Adult Social Care and Health Committee.

Financial Implications (KAS 11/02/2014)

19. There are no financial implications contained within the report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- Report to Committee 9th September 2013

- Copy of survey and model used for consultation
- Revised Equality Impact Assessment

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All

ASCH199