

# HEALTH, SOCIAL CARE AND WELLBEING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 10TH JULY 2012

SUBJECT: PROVISION OF CARE SERVICES AT TREDEGAR COURT

REPORT BY: CORPORATE DIRECTOR SOCIAL SERVICES

#### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To outline proposals to change the way services are provided at Tredegar Court Extra Care Scheme.
- 1.2 To explain to Members how this proposal will contribute to Directorate efficiencies and enable the Adult Services Division to meet current and future cost pressures, brought about by increased demand and budget pressures.

## 2. SUMMARY

- 2.1 The report outlines options for the provision of the care element at Tredegar Court Extra Care Establishment. Currently the Home Assistance Reablement Team (HART) has a budget to provide 378 hours per week of care within this facility.
- 2.2 Following a consultation exercise, presentation of previous reports to Scrutiny Committee in May and September 2011 and receipt of written representation from staff and service users at Tredegar Court, a further third option has been developed for consideration by Scrutiny. This option was not included in the original consultation and has been developed as a direct result of representations from current staff, trade unions and clients in receipt of care who reside at Tredegar Court, in response to the option of externalising care provision to the independent sector.

# 3. LINKS TO STRATEGY

- 3.1 The service reconfiguration proposal in this report supports the Directorate's strategy to reshape services to manage demographic change and the increased demand on services.
- 3.2 The Authority has a five-year Domiciliary Care Strategy from 2007 to 2012, which identifies that the in-house Home Assistance Reablement Team (HART) provides services for clients with complex degenerative conditions who require very high levels of care to reduce risk to users and carers enabling them to remain in their own homes. When Cabinet agreed the strategy, Extra Care was deliberately excluded as it was felt it needed to be looked at separately or as part of other Extra Care schemes in the Borough.

## 4. THE REPORT

- 4.1 There are currently three 'Extra Care' schemes in Caerphilly County Borough; Cefn Glas in Blackwood, Tredegar Court in Crosskeys and Plas Hyfryd in Nantgarw. In-house carers provide care within Tredegar Court from HART. Cefn Glas and Plas Hyfryd are managed through Charter Housing, and care hours are provided through a contract with REACH.
- 4.2 Both Cefn Glas and Plas Hyfryd are purpose built and as such were designed to meet the needs of people with complex needs as opposed to Tredegar Court which was a refurbishment of a previous sheltered housing complex and as such cannot physically accommodate standard adaptations such as ceiling track hoists and level access showers.
- 4.3 Currently HART utilise 378 hours of care per week to support residents of the Extra Care scheme in Tredegar Court. However, currently only 163 hours of support have been determined as being necessary following assessments of need. Previous attempts to rectify this issue have been unsuccessful due to concerns from tenants and family members that carers would not be available on-site on a 24 hour a day basis. As a consequence, more hours care are provided than is actually necessary and clearly this is unsustainable in the current climate where demand for domiciliary care services continues to increase. The surplus hours can be better directed to meet the needs of other service users in the County Borough.
- 4.4 It would appear that tenants, family members and staff continue to view Tredegar Court as a sheltered housing facility and found it difficult to adjust to the change brought about by the move to Extra Care. It should be noted that none of the existing tenants have been assessed as needing 24 hour care and even if staff were not at Tredegar Court overnight then tenants have access to 24-hour support via the authority's telecare system. In the last 6 months only 48 calls have been made to care line between the hours of 11:00pm and 07:00 am by the residents of Tredegar Court.
- 4.5 Services provided within Tredegar Court Extra Care are not consistent with the current in house domiciliary care strategy criteria as they do not have complex degenerative conditions and do not require very high levels of care. Currently 16 tenants receive care from HART, 9 of which receive less than 10 hours, 6 between 10-15 hours and 1 over 15 hours plus a main meal. Calls are primarily single handed non-complex calls. It is not envisaged from the nature of applicant, waiting list and constraints of the building that this will change significantly over time.
- 4.6 As previously stated, within both Cefn Glas and Plas Hyfryd the care is provided by REACH, an independent domiciliary care agency. Presently, REACH provides a total of 730 hours per week across both facilities. REACH were selected to provide this care following a formal tendering process and the tender allows for the option of considering inclusion of Tredegar Court in the future to allow possible further economies of scale around manager posts, out of hours support and cross cover etc.
- 4.7 At a Scrutiny Committee meeting on the 13th September 2011, reference was made to a Care & Social Services Inspectorate for Wales (CSSIW) report for REACH. This report covered Cardiff and not the Caerphilly area. Staff and residents have subsequently been provided with the correct report, a copy of which has been left in the Resource Centre. The report on Caerphilly REACH has no requirements and is viewed as a positive report.
- 4.8 Following a meeting with staff a letter was received from the tenants of Tredegar Court. This letter was signed by 22 people, of which 6 do not currently receive any services from HART. The letter expressed concerns regarding REACH as a provider and was based on the incorrect CSSIW inspection report. The letter also raised concerns for the existing staff and perceived the proposals to be based on mismanagement. Officers have responded in writing to the concerns raised by tenants.

- 4.9 A further letter was sent to service users and their families offering individual meetings to discuss any of their concerns. This resulted in 3 phone calls, one of which related to the potential change of housing provider and the other two from families who were quite clear that they were happy with the status quo and did not wish any changes to take place. One meeting took place with a relative to explain the proposal further and again this person was very happy with the existing care providers and didn't wish any changes to take place. One service user expressed concern regarding potential change of carers and the impact on the times that calls were provided. Staff explained that there would be no change to the level of care provided unless needs changed, which was accepted.
- 4.10 In addition a letter was also received from the staff group indicating their view that the service should remain in house and expressing concern with regard to REACH as a Provider. Staff also submitted some suggestions on how the service at Tredegar Court could be run more efficiently, and where appropriate these suggestions have been implemented.
- 4.11 Staff have been offered 1:1 meetings with trade union representation, which they have declined.
- 4.12 In order to progress this issue officers have identified three options. These are:-

## 4.12.1 Option 1 - Retain the Status Quo

Make no changes to the current provision, with HART continuing to provide on-site care 24 hours a day. The advantage of this option is that there would be no change for service users or staff. The disadvantage would be the failure to address the fact that HART pay for 378 hours care a week but only deliver 163 hours of care a week.

The need to move away from the current position is not only a financial issue. Currently more hours are deployed at Tredegar Court than are required to meet peoples' assessed needs. Given the demographic and service pressures being faced within the authority, it is crucial that these hours are freed up to meet need elsewhere.

The Director of Social Services has a statutory duty to meet assessed need and as such this position is not sustainable operationally.

## 4.12.2 Option 2 - Externalise Care

This option involves the service being transferred to REACH under the provisions in the tendering exercise undertaken for Cefn Glas and Plas Hyfryd. This would continue until August 2013, at which point a formal tendering exercise will be undertaken to identify a Provider across all three Extra Care schemes. This option would ensure that only the 163 hours required as assessed need would be provided.

The advantage of this option is that an hourly rate of £12.47 is already established so savings will be achieved and if REACH provides the service then there will be a consistent Provider across the borough. In addition, having one Provider across all three schemes is likely to bring economies of scale and give opportunities for further efficiencies.

The disadvantage is that there will be a change of provider for existing service users, which is not what the respondents to the consultations wanted, albeit that a limited number of responses were received from service users and families.

## 4.12.3 Option 3 - HART to Continue to Provide Service on an In-Reach Basis.

To enable HART to continue to provide care to Tredegar Court the Domiciliary Care Strategy would need to be implemented and staff would be retained within HART on the same terms and conditions as all other HART employees i.e. 16-hour contracts. Care would be provided to tenants in the same way as it is to all other service users across the borough and there would

not be 24-hour care on site. Care to tenants would be encompassed in community-based rotas.

The advantage of this option is that HART will continue to deliver the service in accordance with tenants' and staff wishes. Staff will remain employed by HART as they requested and financial savings will be achieved.

The disadvantages are that there will not be one consistent provider for Extra Care across the borough and there would not be 24-hour care on-site, which may be an issue for existing service users, albeit that no one has been assessed as needing this service. Housing have confirmed that tenancy agreements do not stipulate 24-hour care on site, however, 24 hours care is stated in the information leaflet. Existing staff would need to be placed on the same terms and conditions as other HART staff i.e. their weekly contracts reduced to 16 hours a week.

#### 5. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

5.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment will be carried out on the 2 viable options and included as an appendix with members' recommendations in the Cabinet report.

## 6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 **Option 1** The current budget of £331,539 would be fully committed if this option were chosen and no financial savings would be achieved. This would mean that alternative savings/efficiency proposals would have to be found to deliver the £220,000 service reconfiguration savings target identified in the Medium-Term Financial Plan.
- 6.2 **Option 2** The current hourly rate charged by REACH is £12.47. This contrasts with the inhouse rate of £16.82 per hour. If the 378 budgeted hours for Tredegar Court are transferred to the independent sector there would be a full-year saving of £86,000. If only the 163 assessed need care hours are transferred then this will generate a saving of £228,000.
- 6.3 **Option 3** This will generate a full year saving of £160,810. This would mean that alternative savings/efficiency proposals totalling £59,190 would be required to achieve the Medium-Term Financial Plan savings target of £220,000.

# 7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are currently 13 HART care staff with varying contracts employed directly in Tredegar Court and all would be eligible to transfer to the new provider under TUPE if option 2 were the preferred option. Staff have previously indicated they would not wish to TUPE transfer and consequently would need to be redeployed within the local authority. However, if option 3 is chosen then there will be implications for staff in terms of a reduction in contracts or in terms of them having to be redeployed in other areas of service where their contracts could be maintained.

## 8. CONSULTATIONS

8.1 There has been significant communication with tenants, staff and Trade Unions since this proposal was initially discussed with the Health, Social Care & Well-being Scrutiny Committee on 17 May 2011. As stated elsewhere within this report tenants and staff are opposed to these changes. Tenants have expressed concern with regard to the loss of carers with whom they

have long standing relationships while staff are concerned with regard to the impact on tenants and the implications for their own employment situation.

8.2 The proposal initially taken to the Health, Social Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee on 17 May 2011 was endorsed by Members subject to further consultation. At the Scrutiny Committee meeting of the 13th September 2011 concerns were expressed with regard to the proposal following the call in of a report on domiciliary care.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 As stated above, from an officer perspective, only options 2 or 3 are viable in terms of moving forward due to statutory responsibilities. Option 2 produces the greater levels of efficiencies whereas option 3 allows the provision of the service to remain in house. Member's views are sought on the preferred option, prior to the submission of a report to Cabinet.

#### 10. REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 Efficiencies achieved as a result of this proposal will assist the Directorate in meeting current and future cost pressures. It will also enable the development of new services to prevent admission to long-term care.

# 11. STATUTORY POWER

11.1 Local Government Act 2000
National Assistance Act 1948
National Health Service And Community Care Act 1990

Author: Dave Street, Assistant Director Adult Services

Consultees: Social Services Senior Management Team

Councillor Robin Woodyatt, Cabinet Member

Cllr. L. Ackerman, Chair of HSC&WB Scrutiny Committee Cllr. B. Jones, Vice-Chair of HSC&WB Scrutiny Committee

Jo Williams, Service Manager, Adult services Andrew Watkins, Senior Assistant Accountant

Richard Ballantine, Personnel Manager

**HART Management Team** 

Helene Day, Sheltered Housing Manager

**Trade Unions**