

Options Appraisal

The Future of Services Currently Provided at Mountview Community Resource Centre Congleton

Council 3 Year Plan Outcome 5 – Living Well

Executive Summary

There was a proposal as part of the budget report of the Council for 2013/14 to seek to achieve potential savings from a review of Mountview services; the potential savings estimate for a full year was £1million. This Options Appraisal provides a full commissioning review of that proposal, including feedback from consultation.

A consultation has been concluded with users, carers and the public to gather feedback on a proposal to replace the services currently provided by Mountview with alternative ways of supporting the current users and carers. The current users and carers of Mountview will continue to have their needs met by the Council as long as their assessed needs meet the Council's Fair Access to Care Services criteria. The users and carers currently meet the Council's Fair Access to Care Services criteria.

There are four types of support currently provided at Mountview:

Type	Capacity
Residential Respite Care for Older People	Unit of up to 22 beds
Residential Respite Care for Dementia sufferers	Secure unit of up to 10 beds
Residential Respite Care for adults with Learning Disability	Separate unit of up to 3 beds
Day Care for Older People	Up to 16 places each day.

Each of these services has been examined separately and options considered that could meet these different client groups' needs. The options that are evaluated are:

Options
<p>1A– Mountview Services Stay As Is no plan to cease services from this building.</p> <p>1B – Mountview Services Stay As Is - but for a defined period whilst other facilities are secured locally in Congleton area.</p>
<p>2A– Day Care Only provided at Mountview. Respite Care at Mountview to cease but to be provided alternatively locally in Congleton area.</p> <p>2B – Day Care Only At Mountview but with a plan to manage to an end as needs/choices of current users change, residential respite care to cease.</p>
<p>3 – Deliver no services from Mountview but provide alternatives locally in Congleton area</p>

The options have been assessed against a set of criteria: Well-being of current users and carers; Feedback from Consultation; Effectiveness in meeting needs; Personalisation (Choice and Control); Future Proofing Support for Changes in Need, and Value for Money.

The Detailed Commissioning Review and Consultation Feedback

The conclusions have been reached by a full and detailed commissioning review in addition to consideration of the consultation feedback and the assessment criteria.

Overall the conclusion is that all 5 options can be effective in meeting current needs.

However when assessed against the criteria there are different benefits and limitations. Each of the 5 Options is assessed against the criteria and the findings and implications for each are shown below.

ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE CRITERIA - The Criteria Explained:

CRITERIA:	
Well-being	How an option might affect the general well-being of current users or carers.
Feedback from Consultation	How an option responds to feedback from users, carers and the public
Effectiveness	Is the option effective in meeting the needs of current users and carers?
Personalisation (Choice and Control)	<p>This policy direction is about ensuring that users and carers have as wide a range of support types as possible. Having flexible choices will mean that individuals can plan their own very personalised support. Our current system offers a limited choice that is inflexible. For example day care operates in the day from Monday to Friday. Carers may need respite support outside those hours.</p> <p>The Council is planning to review all in-house services (Care4ce) to consider how to ensure they can meet the future requirements of personalisation. This is not about Direct Payments, though they could be used, the Council would manage the system so that it is easy to get a flexible package with or without a Direct Payment.</p>
Future Proofing for Demographics and Types and Levels of Needs	<p>The demographics for Congleton show a predicted increase in future physical frailty and dementia. Would the option enable developments that are a better fit for needs of the future?</p> <p>The Council is planning to review all in-house services (Care4ce) to consider how to ensure they can meet the future types and levels of need effectively.</p>
Value for Money	Economic – comparative unit cost. Efficient way to meet a need. Effective in meeting needs. The Council must ensure it secures value for money; this enables more people to be supported within the total budget.

The results of the assessment options against these criteria are provided below:

Appendix 1

	1A Stay As Is (indefinitely)	1B Stay As Is for a Defined Period to develop alternative resource	2A Day Care Only Continues (indefinitely)	2B Day Care Only Continues -for a defined period: current users only	3 No services delivered from Mountview
Well-being of current users and carers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ no disruption or anxiety for any current users and carers X learning disability users are not receiving specialist support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ no immediate disruption for any current users √users and carers can influence change and personalise √Learning disability users specialist alternative within a known time frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ no disruption for day care users X disruption for respite care users √ potential for more specialist support to be commissioned for Learning Disability users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ no disruption for day care users X disruption for respite care users √specialist Learning Disability support √ choice develops to meet future needs in a personalised way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X Disruption and anxiety for all users and carers √ more specialist support to be commissioned for Learning Disability users
Consultation Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ most users and carers expressed this as their wish √ most users and carers wanted support in Congleton √ public feedback supports this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X most users and carers expressed a preference for Mountview to stay √ Some users and carers using older people respite said they would use a different building with similar support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ meets concerns of current day care users and carers X Does not immediately address respite users concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ meets concerns of current day care users and carers X Does not immediately address respite users concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X Does not immediately address user and carer concerns.
Effectiveness in Meeting Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ effective in meeting current needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ effective for current needs and planned alternatives for future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ effective as alternatives will be provided for respite care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ effective as alternatives will be provided for respite care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ effective as alternatives will be provided for all current users.
Personalisation (Choice and Control) – future proofing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X no choice or flexibility to allow personalisation √ some users and carers say they do not want choice and flexibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ choice and flexibility can be planned so that new options are available that can be more personalised and may then be preferred by users and carers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ more choice and flexibility can be planned for respite users to allow personalisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ more choice and flexibility can be planned for respite users to personalise √ future needs can be met in personalised ways rather than only day care. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ more choice and flexibility can be planned for respite users to personalise X some users and carers say they do not want choice and flexibility
Demographics /Needs Analysis – Future Proofing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X Older people will be increasingly frail. Future requires en-suite, ceiling track hoists. X Mountview has limitations: size of the plot means facilities above would be at very high cost per unit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ Future facilities in an alternative form could be planned and secured in a timely way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X retaining of a block purchased day care service indefinitely, based on current types of need, would restrict future planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ Future facilities in an alternative form could be planned and secured in a timely way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ alternative models of support could be developed sooner that would be designed to meet future needs.
Value for Money (economy and efficiency)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X respite care for older people and with dementia can be secured in the independent sector at lower unit cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X respite care for older people and with dementia can be secured in the independent sector at lower unit cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ Day care in this form not available in current market. √ respite care for older people and with dementia can be secured in the independent sector at lower unit cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ Day care in this form not available in current market. √ respite care for older people and with dementia can be secured in the independent sector at lower unit cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> √ respite care for older people and with dementia can be secured in the independent sector at lower unit cost.
Potential to meet Savings Proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No savings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No savings. May be savings later dependent upon new resource decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicative savings of £170-300 per week of respite care could be achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicative savings of £170-300 per week of respite care could be achieved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicative savings of £170-300 per week of respite care could be achieved.

Overall Summary

All 5 options can meet the needs of current users and carers; however each option has different benefits, implications and risks.

Option 1A – Mountview Services Stay As Is - Indefinitely

This option would meet the expressed wishes of users, carers and the public. However it would limit the ability to future proof services to meet higher level dependencies. The indefinite block purchasing of these residential respite beds will limit choice and personalisation in the future. This option also restricts the opportunity for the Council to gain better value for money. Indicative savings of £170-£ 300 per week of residential respite care could be achieved by using the independent sector for this care.

Financial Implications.

No savings would be made. The savings proposed in the budget for 2013/14 of £325k and onwards of £1m (£600k if considered on a net basis after accounting for the additional cost incurred in Individual Commissioning) in a full year would have to be found in other ways. This may mean reducing or withdrawing services, such as preventative services.

Risks

The opportunity to develop personalised, value for money, affordable support for the future is restricted.

.Option 1B - Mountview Services Stay As Is - but for a defined period

This option has some key benefits over Option 1A in that it allows for a plan to future proof support and increase choice at a later date. This would also mean the opportunity to gain value for money is delayed but not indefinitely. Another benefit is that it would mean any future changes would not require a new consultation with users and carers as the decision would be made now about a future planned change.

Financial Implications.

No savings would be made. The savings proposed in the budget for 2013/14 of £325k and onwards of £1 million (£600k in a full year would have to be found in other ways. This may mean reducing or withdrawing services, such as preventative services. There may be savings at a later date dependent upon other resource developments.

Risks

The opportunity to develop personalised, value for money, affordable support for the future is restricted until a later date. The risk of having to consult again on the service offered at Mountview would be mitigated.

Option 2A– Day Care Only provided at Mountview.

This option would meet the expressed wishes of users of the day care service and their carers. The need to retain the day care service model as it is for the current users and carers is accepted and all 5 options achieve this. The indefinite block purchasing of this day care service may limit choice; when more choice becomes available people may not wish to choose this type of support.

This Option has benefits over Options 1A and B in that more choices and personalisation could be developed now for those who require residential respite support. This independent sector has the capacity to provide this in a more flexible and value for money way. Indicative savings of £170-£300 per week of residential respite care could be achieved by using the independent sector for this care.

Financial Implications.

Some of the savings proposed in the budget for 2013/14 could be achieved. Option 2A would result in the Council being able to achieve improved value for money for older people and dementia respite care. The scale of that improved value for money and savings can only be estimated at this stage. The usage of respite beds in the last 12 months is approximately 1052 bed weeks of respite. This would indicate a potential saving of approximately £425k per annum on the current unit costs at Mountview attributable to the service for older people and dementia respite.

Risks

The opportunity to develop personalised, value for money, affordable support for the future is restricted for the day care users of the future.

Option 2B - Day Care Only At Mountview but with a plan to manage to an end

This option would meet the expressed wishes of users of the day care service and their carers. This option has some key benefits over Option 1A, 1B and 2A in that it allows for a plan to increase choice and personalisation now for residential respite users and at a later date for day care. This would mean improved value for money could be achieved for residential respite. Indicative savings of £170-300 per week of residential respite care could be achieved by using independent sector for this care. Another benefit is that it would mean any future changes would not require a new

consultation with users and carers as the decision would be made now about a future planned change. New users would have their needs met in alternative, personalised ways.

Financial Implications.

The savings proposed in the budget for 13/14 could be achieved in part. Option 2B would result in the Council being able to achieve improved value for money for older people and dementia respite care. The scale of that improved value for money and savings can only be estimated at this stage. The usage of respite beds in the last 12 months is approximately 1052 bed weeks of respite. This would indicate a potential saving of approximately £425k per annum on the current unit costs at Mountview attributable to the service for older people and dementia respite.

The unit costs of the day care service are likely to increase as the numbers of users reduce over time.

Risks

No risks identified. New users would have their needs met by alternative means.

Option 3 - Deliver no services from Mountview

This option would require a new venue to be found for the day care service; which must continue for the current users needs. This is unlikely to be achieved quickly. The staff group for this day care would stay the same as it is likely that TUPE would apply in this circumstance. No indications of better value for money being available for a like for like alternative day care service.

This option would mean improved value for money could be achieved for residential respite. Indicative savings of £170-300 per week of residential respite care could be achieved by using independent sector for this care.

This option would mean that the Mountview building would cease to provide any support for older people or their carers. This option was opposed in consultation feedback by users, carers and the public.

Financial Implications.

The savings proposed in the budget for 13/14 could be achieved in part. The Council would be able to achieve improved value for money for older people and dementia respite care. The scale of that improved value for money and savings can only be estimated at this stage. The usage of respite beds in the last 12 months is approximately 1052 bed weeks of respite. This would indicate a potential saving of approximately £425k per annum on the current unit costs at Mountview attributable to the service for older people and dementia respite.

Risks

Finding a suitable alternative venue for the day care service may not be easy and this would cause anxiety and disruption for the users and carers.

The Conclusions and Recommendations

The Day Care Service

There is a clear need to continue to provide a day time support service in the Congleton town area for the current users of that service, who are very local. The current service is effective and valued by these users, carers and by social care managers. Any disruption of this service would be difficult for the current users who in the main are very frail and have complex needs for which stability creates a positive effect on well-being. There is no current alternative service in the independent sector.

For the future there needs to be more choice and flexibility in the range of ways that users and carers can be supported so that support is personalised. This could mean that this type of day care would not be a preferred choice in future. The future choices need to be informed by the needs and wishes of older people who may require support.

Residential Respite - Older People

Respite support for carers of older people could be provided effectively in alternative ways. There is capacity in the residential care independent sector to meet this need. All users, carers and social care managers agreed that services need to be local; this has been estimated from consultation feedback as being within approximately 5/7 miles of the centre of Congleton. Users and carers expressed a desire to retain their services at Mountview, but a number agreed that they would be happy to use an equivalent independent sector service. Because this service is used intermittently there is not as strong an impact on well-being if a different service is used. The unit cost of a week in a respite bed in the independent sector would be likely to be up to £170 per week less than a week in Mountview based on highest occupancy (85%). When occupancy is lower (e.g. 67%) then this difference could be up to £250 per week.

Table: comparative weekly costs Mountview and external providers:

	Dementia Respite	Older People Residential Respite
Mountview Total Cost per bed/week based on 85% occupancy	£741.78	£596.44
Mountview Total Cost per bed/week based on 67% occupancy	£941.07	£756.68
Mountview Total Cost per bed/week based on 50% occupancy	£1,261.03	£1,013.95
Estimated External provider costs	£525	£425

For the future however there needs to be more choice and flexibility in the range of ways that users and carers can be supported so that a more personalised support can be designed. This could mean that this type of residential respite would not be a preferred choice in future.

Residential Respite Dementia

Respite support for carers of older people with dementia is provided effectively at Mountview but could also be provided in alternative ways. There is capacity in the residential care independent sector to meet this need. All users, carers and social care managers agreed that services need to be local; this has been estimated from consultation feedback as being within approximately 5/7 miles of the centre of Congleton. Users and carers feedback expressed a desire to retain their services at Mountview because of familiarity. The unit cost of a week in a dementia respite bed in the independent sector would be likely to be up to £215 per week less than a week in Mountview based on highest occupancy (85%). If occupancy is lower at times, for example 67%, then this difference could be up to £400 per week.

For the future however there needs to be more choice and flexibility in the range of ways that users and carers can be supported so that a more personalised support can be designed. This could mean that this type of residential respite would not be a preferred choice in future.

Residential Respite for Adults with Learning Disabilities

The support provided at Mountview is not the type of specialist support that can meet the very complex needs some users now have. The service at Mountview was not designed for these very complex needs. It is desirable to design different support for these adults with learning disabilities with very complex needs. This support does not need to be in the Congleton area, carers understand that for very highly specialised and skilled support they may have to travel outside their home area. These alternatives are already used regularly to meet complex needs.

Recommendations

All 5 Options can be effective in meeting the needs of current users and carers. Assessing the options on other criteria there are different benefits and limitations. These are highlighted in summary only, detail is provided later in this report. These recommendations are based upon officers' professional evaluation of how well the options appraised meet the assessment criteria.

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that day care support for current users and their carers is provided in the same model as now and in the Congleton town area.

In the majority of individual circumstances older people and their carers required support that is local in order to most benefit. The frailty and needs of these particular users and the negative effect of a disruption mean that this model should continue for current users.

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that using the independent sector for residential respite care would have benefits for personalisation, value for money, future proofing and achieving savings.

Recommendation 3

It is recommended that option 2B is the preferred option for the following reasons:

2B - Day Care Only At Mountview but with a plan to manage to an end as the needs/preferences of current users change and alternative options are developed. Respite care to cease.

This option has some key benefits over Option 1A, 1B and 2A in that it allows for a plan to increase choice and personalisation now for residential respite users and at a later date for day care. This would mean improved value for money could be

achieved for residential respite. Indicative savings of £170 -300 per week of residential respite care could be achieved by using independent sector for this care. Another benefit is that it would mean any future changes would not require a new consultation with users and carers as the decision would be made now about a future planned change. This Option would mean Mountview continues to provide day care support for current users and carers until their needs/preferences change.

Recommendation 4

It is recommended that the respite for adults with learning disabilities ceases at Mountview. The assessment has concluded that for adults with learning disability with complex needs the current support at Mountview is not effective.

The Implications of these recommendations:

The current users and carers of the day care service would have stability of service

The appropriate building space and facilities at Mountview, or an alternative building, would continue to be needed for this purpose.

The support for adults with learning disability with complex needs would be de-commissioned and support secured alternatively.

Equality Impact Assessment

A full equality impact assessment is provided in the Appendices to this report. All but Option 1A has implications that are addressed in the EIA and extracted in the commentary above as relevant.

Overall Risks

There is a risk of continued anxiety in the user and carer group. To mitigate this risk the future plans would need to be articulated in a timely way to enable change to be well-managed.

The reputation of the Council would be at risk if the future plan timetable and commitments in any of these options are not implemented effectively.

There is a risk that respite beds in the independent market are so variable in their availability that support would be unreliable. The mitigation is to consider securing a small number of independent sector beds through a block contract. Other beds would be purchased on an ad hoc basis and there would be a framework and system for managing that. All services in the independent sector would be required to meet a set quality standard in order to be part of the purchasing arrangements.

Financial Implications of Recommended Option – 2B – Day Care Continues - Respite Care Ceases

Option 2B would result in the Council being able to achieve improved value for money for older people and dementia respite care. The scale of that improved value for money and savings can only be estimated at this stage. The usage of respite beds in the last 12 months is approximately 1070 bed weeks of respite. This would indicate a potential saving of approximately £425k per annum on the current unit costs at Mountview attributable to the service for older people and dementia respite.

If the financial implications are considered over a longer time period than one year Option 2B ensures that savings can start to be accumulated sooner than another Option.

The Learning Disability service will cease and is estimated to cost approximately £233,267 per annum. Ending this service will produce savings of this amount from the Mountview budget but alternative respite will need to be secured on an individual case basis in the independent sector. The unit costs of a more specialist service will be high; this change may not produce any overall savings as respite will continue to need to be secured in the independent sector for very complex needs.