

HEALTH, SOCIAL CARE AND WELLBEING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 11TH SEPTEMBER 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 This report will outline examples of where the authority successfully supports people with high needs to remain in their own homes for as long as possible using a range of services. This means we are confident that that the proposals contained in this report will enable the individuals to continue to live at Tredegar Court safely by a combination of personal care, meal provision, domestic support and Telecare.
- 2.3 Reviews recently undertaken have confirmed that the needs of all the current tenants can be met by the combination of domiciliary care staff and Telecare. Tenants will continue to receive at least annual reviews to ensure their needs will continue to be met.
- 2.4 This matter was previously brought to Scrutiny Committee on the 17 May 2011, 13th September 2011 and 10 July 2012. following the meeting in July 2012 Members recommended to Cabinet that,
 - i. The matter be deferred to enable, where appropriate, a review of service users, in conjunction with staff feedback .
 - ii. A further report be presented to the next meeting of Scrutiny Committee.
- 2.5 This report will also provide additional clarification on some of the issues raised by Members at the meeting of the 10 July 2012.

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.

4. THE REPORT

- 4.1 Tredegar Court was the first extra care facility that was created within the County Borough. It aimed to promote independence and choice for older people in respect of accommodation and catered for a mix of people with low / medium / high / level need. The development was welcomed in both Social Services and Housing as Tredegar Court was traditionally a hard to let scheme with significant voids. It should be noted that Tredegar Court is not run or managed by Social Services, it is part of the authority's housing stock.
- 4.2 Tredegar Court was set up at a time where extra care provision was relatively new and there was no definitive research on its benefits / outcomes. The service was developed in accordance with priorities set out by the Welsh Assembly Government at the time.
- 4.3 Subsequent extra care provision at Cefn Glas and Plas Hyfryrd were purpose built and as such were designed to meet the needs of people with complex needs.
- 4.4 The authority has followed an ongoing programme of ensuring, wherever possible, that citizens of the County Borough maintain their independence for as long as possible and do not become dependent on services. Extra Care is one of a range of services available to people which assists with independence as it allows tenants to come and go as they please and to access the community whenever they choose to do so, by making a life style choice to move to more suitable accommodation.
- 4.5 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, these hours are currently under review however even if they increase it will not be to the extent of all the hours being currently utilised. 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.
- 4.6 It would appear that tenants, family members and staff continue to view Tredegar Court as a residential care home 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. Currently tenants access care line outside either times calls, during the day the careline calls go to the scheme manager which will not change during the other hours they go to the care staff when appropriate. 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 tenants of Tredegar Court. On fifteen occasions the calls related to entry to the building. Of the other 33 calls carers were sent to the individuals, as this is the current process. However, only one of these calls needed urgent intervention and, the telecare operator arranged for an out of hours GP to attend.
- 4.7 Extra Care is a valuable part of a range of accommodation options and it must be recognised that no establishment can be a guaranteed home for life. As individuals needs change other alternatives may be more appropriate. It has been brought to our attention that a leaflet was produced some time ago which references "on site staff 24 hours a day and 24 hour emergency response from Caerphilly Care line". Clearly should the proposals contained in this report be accepted then the leaflet will have to be redesigned.
- 4.8 It should be noted that the tenancy agreement between the authority and the tenant makes no reference to 24 hour staff on site and the authority is not legally obliged to provide this service.
- 4.9 Tenants at Tredegar Court who receive care are currently subject to individual reviews. Calls are primarily single handed non-complex in nature and it is not envisaged from the nature of applicant, and waiting list that this will change significantly over time. It should be noted that the establishment has been successful in reducing voids with tenants making choices about their housing needs.

- 4.10 In comparison, HART currently provide care to approximately 130 individuals in their own homes with an average package of care of 28 hours per week. The majority of these individuals are also supported with Telecare and this demonstrates that people with far higher needs than those people currently residing at Tredegar Court can be supported safely by a mix of staff support and assistive technology. In the event of a tenant needing to access the telecare service they would activate the alarm which would immediately connect to the telecare centre. The tenants details come up on the operators screen who would establish what the problem and determine the most appropriate course of action e.g. contacting out of hours GPs, emergency services, family members or urgent repairs to the property.
- 4.11 At Scrutiny Committee on the 10 July 2012 a number of issues were raised by Members in relations to the options put forward by officers. To assist in consideration of this report the following additional information is provided,
- 4.11.1 **Reviews:** As explained in paragraph 2.3, in accordance with Members recommendations, where appropriate, tenants who had previously been assessed by Social Services were offered reviews of those assessments. These reviews have been carried out and a verbal update on the outcome of the reviews will be provided to members at the meeting. An initial analysis has shown that of the 11 reviews undertaken at the time of writing the report, four tenants needs remain unchanged, two have increased and five have reduced.
- 4.11.2 **Fire: Evacuation:** Discussions with Housing and Health & Safety staff have confirmed that a “stay put” policy is in place and the building should not be evacuated.
- 4.11.3 **Weekly Rent and Service Charge:** It has been clarified that the weekly rent and service charge paid to Housing by tenants does not contain an element for care. Consequently should night time provision be removed there would be no loss of income to the authority which would reduce the overall savings made. Housing colleagues have confirmed that the weekly rent does not include an element for care (see Appendix 1) and the efficiencies are as laid out in section 6 of this report. Tenants are charged for their care via the authority’s fairer charging policy and is based on the assessed hours they receive, no tenant pays for access to 24 hour care.
- 4.11.4 **24 hour Support:** It should be noted that Tredegar Court is not a residential care home. Staff have been on site to meet unplanned need but this has been as a result of an historical arrangement as opposed to being a response to an assessed need.
- 4.11.5 **Telecare:** The authority has invested significantly in the provision of Telecare equipment and has many examples of where it enables people to remain in their own homes over a 24 hour period. Telecare operators are already very experience at dealing with people who have care needs and will arrange for an appropriate response from emergency services, other professionals or family members.
- 4.11.6 **Night Time Support:** The modernisation of social care services has meant that should people need assistance / reassurance during the night then this can be delivered by Telecare operators as opposed to having staff on site. As previously stated, this model already operates very successfully within the community.
- 4.12 In order to progress this issue officers have identified three options. These are:
- 4.12.1 **Option 1 Retain the current status quo**

Make no changes to the current provision HART to continue to provide on site care 24 hours a day. The advantage to this would be there will be no change for service users or staff. The disadvantage would be the failures to address the fact that HART pay for 378 hours a week of rostered care 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 Statutory 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 the current provider given that previous procurement exercise allowed for this. 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 hourly rate of £12.47 is already established so savings will be achieved, if REACH provided service then there will be a consistent provider across the borough. In addition, having one provider across all three schemes are likely to bring economies of scale and give opportunities for further efficiencies.

The disadvantage is there will be a change of provider for existing service user, which is not what the respondents to the consultations, wanted, albeit 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 thus 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 residents of the borough and there would not be 24-hour care on site. Care to tenants would be encompassed in community-based rotas.

The advantages to this option are 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.

Disadvantages include, 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 agreement doesn't 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 condition 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 two viable options and included as an appendix with members' recommendations in the Cabinet report.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- Option 1 – The current budget of £331,539 would be fully committed if this option were chosen hence no financial savings will be agreed. This would mean alternative savings efficiency proposals will have to be found to compensate for the £228,000 saving identified in the 2012/13 base budget.

- Option 2 – The current hourly rate charged by REACH is £12.47. This contrasts with the in-house 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 £86,000. If only the 163-care hours assessed needs are then this will generate a saving of over £228,000.
- Option 3 - This will generate a full year saving of £160,810. This would mean alternative savings efficiency proposals will have to be found to compensate for the £67,000 that would have been delivered under option 2.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There are currently 11 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 implication for staff in terms of reduction in contracts or in terms of them having to be redeployed in other areas of services 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 the 17 May 2011. As stated elsewhere within this report tenants, family members and staff are opposed to these changes. Tenants expressed concern with regard to the loss of carers over the 24 hours period, with whom they have long standing relationships while staff were concerned with regard to the impact on tenants and the implications for their own employment situation.
- 8.2 Since the last report to Health, Social Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee on the 10th July 2012 a letter was received from the staff group outlining their concerns around the proposals. A full response was made to the staff and their Trade Unions and a subsequent letter received from the staff in Mid August has been acknowledged
- 8.3 A further letter was sent to service users and their families offering individual meetings to discuss any of their concerns. Two letters have been received from family members and four telephone calls received querying the detail of the proposals. Family members have participated in the reviews of the care packages, where they have wished to do so.
- 8.4 This proposal was initially taken to Health, Social Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee on the 17th May 2011 and the proposal initially endorsed by Members. 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 with regard to domiciliary care.
- 8.5 The three options laid out in paragraphs 4.12.1 to 4.12.2 were considered by to Health, Social Care & Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee on the 6th December 2011 and the 10th July 2012.

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, for final consideration at Cabinet on the 18th September 2012.

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

Authors: Dave Street, Assistant Director Adult Services
Consultees: Social Services Senior Management Team
Councillor Robin Woodyatt, Cabinet Member For Social Services
Jo Williams, Service Manager, Adult services
Shaun Couzens, Chief Housing Officer
Andrew Watkins, Senior Assistant Accountant
Richard Ballantine, Human Resources Manager
HART Management Team
Graham North, Public Sector Housing Manager
Trade Unions
Legal Services

Appendices:
Appendix 1 - Tredegar Court Extra Care Scheme Tenant Charges 2012-13