

# **Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee**

## **Agenda**

---

**Date:** Thursday, 15th March, 2012  
**Time:** 10.00 am  
**Venue:** Committee Suite 2/3 - Westfields, Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ

---

The agenda is divided into 2 parts. Part 1 is taken in the presence of the public and press. Part 2 items will be considered in the absence of the public and press for the reasons indicated on the agenda and at the foot of each report.

### **PART 1 – MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS PRESENT**

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Minutes of Previous meeting** (Pages 1 - 6)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2012

3. **Declaration of Interests/Party Whip**

To provide an opportunity for Members and Officers to declare any personal and/or prejudicial interests or members to declare the existence of a party whip in relation to any item on the agenda.

4. **Public Speaking Time/Open Session**

A total period of 15 minutes is allocated for members of the public to make a statement(s) on any matter that falls within the remit of the Committee.

Individual members of the public may speak for up to 5 minutes, but the Chairman will decide how the period of time allocated for public speaking will be apportioned, where there are a number of speakers

Note: In order for officers to undertake any background research, it would be helpful if members of the public notified the Scrutiny officer listed at the foot of the agenda, at least one working day before the meeting with brief details of the matter to be covered.

---

Please contact Mark Grimshaw on 01270 685680  
E-Mail: [mark.grimshaw@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:mark.grimshaw@cheshireeast.gov.uk) any apologies or requests for further information or to give notice of a question to be asked by a member of the public

---

5. **The Cheshire and Wirral Councils' Joint Scrutiny Committee Minutes** (Pages 7 - 12)

To receive the minutes of The Cheshire and Wirral Councils' Joint Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 23 January 2012 for information.

6. **Empower Card**

To consider a report of the Strategic Director of Children, Families and Adults (to follow).

7. **Progress Report on the Adults Local Account** (Pages 13 - 18)

To consider a report of the Strategic Director of Children, Families and Adults.

8. **Performance Report**

To consider a report of the Strategic Director of Children, Families and Adults (to follow)

9. **Adult Services Transport**

To consider a report of the Strategic Director of Children, Families and Adults (to follow).

10. **Work Programme Update** (Pages 19 - 32)

To give consideration to the work programme.

**CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL**

Minutes of a meeting of the **Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee**  
held on Wednesday, 18th January, 2012 at Committee Suite 2/3 - Westfields,  
Middlewich Road, Sandbach, CW11 1HZ

**PRESENT**

Councillor M J Simon (Chairman)  
Councillor B Silvester (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors C Andrew, D Bebbington, I Faseyi, L Jeuda, S Jones, F Keegan,  
J Saunders and M Grant

**Apologies**

Councillors J Jackson, B Murphy and D Stockton

**In Attendance**

Councillors R Domleo, O Hunter and D Flude

**Officers**

Lucia Scally – Head of Strategic Commissioning and Safeguarding  
Jacqui Evans – Head of Local Delivery/Independent Living Services  
Patrick Rhoden – Principal Accountant  
Karen Whitehead – Private Sector Housing Manager  
Mark Grimshaw – Scrutiny Officer

**41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Chairman noted that those Members who had provided their apologies were absent due to a meeting clash with the Strategic Planning Committee which had been moved forward due to a heavy agenda. A concern was expressed that this had been done without due consideration to the scheduled Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.

**42 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2011 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**43 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS/PARTY WHIP**

None noted.

**44 PUBLIC SPEAKING TIME/OPEN SESSION**

Charlotte Peters-Rock, a representative from Knutsford Area for Knutsford Action, attended to address the Committee. She made the following points:

- That the Committee should commend the Portfolio Holder for Adult Services for relinquishing control of the Health and Wellbeing Portfolio as it was argued that this was creating a conflict of interest. Mrs Peters-Rock stated that the Committee should examine what the impact of having both portfolios joined for several months had been.
- The Committee was asked what it was doing to oversee the distress caused by the actions of the Council – without prior consultation – towards service users and their family carers (with regard to the ongoing Building Base Review). It was asserted that this issue required an urgent response as Mrs Peters-Rock argued that the Health and Wellbeing Committee had abrogated responsibility for such health and wellbeing oversight to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.
- The Committee was also asked to undertake a review of the 'severe strain' caused to service users and their family carers (as a result of the Building Based Review) so that such strain could be mitigated wherever possible. She asserted that in future, the reasoning behind similar decisions should be made clear and that consultations should be held in advance so that no adverse decisions would be made which disadvantage 'the vulnerable', whether they be service users or their family carers.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Peters-Rock for her attendance and assured her that a written response would be provided.

#### **45 ADULT SOCIAL CARE BUDGET - UPDATE ON 2011/12 OUTTURN**

Members considered a report on the financial outturn of the Adult's Department for 2011-12. This report built on the Mid Year Review of Financial Performance and provided further information on the mitigation strategies which were in place to help to reduce forecast overspends. Patrick Rhoden, Principal Accountant, reported that whilst the Three Quarter Financial position had yet to be finalised, the indication was that there would be a reduction in the overspend from the Mid Year position.

Lucia Scally, Head of Strategic Commissioning and Safeguarding, continued to go through each part of the Adult's budget, highlighting the reasons for the overspend and what mitigation strategies had been put in place as a result. Members asked questions and made comments after each area.

Care4CE

Lucia Scally reported that there was a projected £1.1m overspend in this area and that this was due to the delay in delivering the rationalisation of building use and linked temporary decommissioning of ECT beds.

It was queried why there had been a delay in the rationalisation and what lessons had been learned. Councillor Roland Domleo, Portfolio Holder for Adult Services, commented that it was vital that the consultation process had been as comprehensive as possible and therefore the delay had been necessary. He also noted that the process of building valuation had taken longer than expected. In terms of what had been learned, Councillor Domleo noted that in future there would have to be a proper programme time plan on such a project.

It was questioned how long it would take to complete the Building Based Review and whether this would have an impact on the 2012/13 budget. A number of Members were doubtful that the proposed saving would be realised as the rationalisation process would not begin until after April 2012. Councillor Domleo stated that the saving would be incremental and Lucia Scally noted that the service would account for the savings profile once a final decision had been reached.

Attention was drawn to a point that had been made in a previous meeting regarding a purported disjoint between assets and adult social care which had a part to play in delaying the building base review thereby negating any potential savings for 2011/12. It was noted that this point would be reiterated when the final Building Base Review paper was submitted to scrutiny.

### Individual Commissioning

Jacqui Evans, Head of Local Delivery/Independent Living Services, reported that there was a forecasted £3.241m overspend and that this position had not changed dramatically since the Mid Year Review. She explained that the overspend position was due to two main factors. Firstly, increased numbers in residential and nursing care, either because people were living longer in these settings or because individuals were increasingly depleting their own financial capital and as a result were turning to the Council for care cost support. Secondly, those in receipt of care were tending to require larger packages than individuals presenting for care previously. Jacqui Evans continued to outline ongoing initiatives which were in place to try and mitigate demand. These were linked to the preventative and re-ablement agendas and it was suggested that Scrutiny might receive a report detailing this work at a subsequent meeting.

A number of comments were made in support of the preventative work that the Council was doing in order to help reduce demand on services and it stated that this should be continued. Attention was drawn to assistive technology and in particular how important it was that information regarding this service was disseminated as widely as possible. It was suggested that putting on road shows would be a good way of achieving this. Jacqui Evans acknowledged that these were helpful comments and noted that the Council did advise people in terms of assistive technology on their first contact with the Council. She also reported that the Council was looking at a business case for employing more staff to communicate with partners and end users about the potential of assistive technology.

It was queried whether there was any update with regards to the money that was to be recouped from the Direct Payments budget. Jacqui Evans reported that this was an on-going process.

It was questioned whether there had been any impact on the respite budget as a result of the increasing trend of the elderly caring for the elderly. Jacqui Evans explained that this was being looked at as part of the Building Based Review. She acknowledged that the challenge for the Department was in how to provide both sufficient general respite and the more costly dementia respite care for which there was now a greater demand. She asserted that a balance was required but that it was likely that the number dementia respite beds would be increasing.

It was queried what the service was doing to evaluate the efficacy and appropriateness of care packages. Jacqui Evans drew attention to the on-going work to review care packages. She reported that this had saved approximately £4.4m by applying Fair Access to Care (FACS) criteria and by increasingly offering preventative and re-ablement options. Jacqui Evans also confirmed that work was being done to analyse why some money in the direct payments budget had not been spent.

Attention was drawn to the proposed savings in the adult transport budget. It was queried why the figure for transport was going up by £500k in 2012/13 and back down to the 2011/12 figure in 2013/14. Councillor Roland Domleo explained that there was a one-off cost required in 2012/13 in order to make transport efficiencies in the future. It was acknowledged that this did not explain why the 2013/14 figure had not decreased beyond that in 2011/12, even after money being spent to achieve efficiencies. Jacqui Evans agreed to explore this issue further at the next meeting.

### Strategic Commissioning

Lucia Scally noted that there was an overspend of £0.785m projected for this area. She reported that the service had already taken remedial action using areas of underspend and savings.

It was queried whether the service had carried out an impact assessment as a result of the proposed welfare cuts from central government. Lucia reported that Alison McCudden, Commissioning Manager – Income Maximisation, had produced a paper on this issue which could possibly come to Scrutiny if required.

It was questioned how much of the re-ablement agenda was funded by the NHS. Jacqui Evans explained that the NHS funded the 6 week intermediate care package and that the department was looking at convergences and synergies with the Council's own re-ablement services in order to create further efficiencies. It was requested that the Committee receive further explanation on the work around re-ablement agenda and what the impact of this had been and what it might be in the future.

In providing a final comment, Councillor Roland Domleo asserted that whilst the projected £4.1m overspend was disappointing, a lot of the reasons behind it were due to one-off and unavoidable costs. Therefore, if these costs were stripped away, the budget would nearly break even which was a significant achievement considering the growth pressures that were present.

### RESOLVED –

- a) That the report be received.
- b) That a further budget paper be brought to the next meeting of the Committee and that this include:
  - a. Further information on projected transport savings
  - b. Further information on the work on-going around re-ablement.

#### 46 **DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT**

Members received a presentation on the cost benefits of Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) from Karen Whitehead, Private Sector Housing Manager. She explained that the presentation was in response to a request from the Committee following an earlier report on DFGs. This had asked that a robust business case be brought which outlined the invest-to-save benefits of DFGs.

Karen Whitehead reported that the service had examined 21 cases where adaptations had been carried out by looking into the following areas to calculate saving/cost avoidance and payback period:

- Cost of care package prior to adaptation
- Cost of adaptation
- Cost of care package after adaptation.

With the use of case studies, Karen Whitehead demonstrated that there were examples of how DFGs could result in cost avoidance, cost savings and other benefits that were not necessarily economic.

In sum, Karen Whitehead explained that whilst it was not possible to generate a reliable figure for the potential cost saving/cost avoidance of DFGs, it was clear from the analysis that there were significant social and economic benefits of independent living.

It was queried that if the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) removed their portion of the funding, would the Council still feel it worthwhile to continue with providing DFGs. Karen Whitehead asserted that removing the DFG budget would have a significant impact on residents as a number of people have relied on the grant in order to remain independent. Patrick Rhoden added that if the Council invested more in DFGs from the capital programme this would likely make a significant revenue saving.

It was questioned how the Council arranged contracts for the work. Karen Whitehead explained that this was where the Home Improvement Agency (HIA) became involved. They helped the resident find a reputable tradesman and then they also supervised the work. It was noted that the resident was free to arrange their own contract but that the HIA would still supervise the work.

Regarding the invest-to-save potential of DFGs, it was queried whether any progress had been made in achieving extra funding. Karen Whitehead reported that the service was undertaking a pilot to look at the short term payback options e.g. stair lifts to explore whether these could be made more widely available. She also noted that the 2012/13 budget for DFGs had increased to £1,500,000 from £1,320,000 in 2011/12.

RESOLVED – That the presentation be noted.

#### 47 **WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

Members considered the work programme. The Chairman suggested that as there were a number of overlaps with the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee and the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee, the Scrutiny Officer should distribute both agendas to both Committees for their consideration. An update

was also provided on the Dementia Task and Finish Review as it was noted that the Group were likely to produce their final report in March.

It was also suggested that the next informal meeting of the Committee be brought forward to before Full Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> February. This was so comment could be made on the draft business plan before it was formally voted on at Full Council.

RESOLVED –

- a) That the work programme be noted.
- b) That the Scrutiny Officer distribute both the Adult Social Care and Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee agendas to the Membership of both Committees in order to help identify cross-cutting issues.
- c) That the next informal meeting be re-scheduled to a date prior to 23<sup>rd</sup> February so that comment can be passed on the draft business plan before Full Council.

### 48 **FORWARD PLAN - EXTRACTS**

The Committee gave consideration to the extracts of the forward plan which fell within the remit of the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the forward plan be noted.

The meeting commenced at 10.05 am and concluded at 12.15 pm

Councillor M J Simon (Chairman)



**CHESHIRE AND WIRRAL COUNCILS' JOINT  
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**23 JANUARY 2012**

**(2.00 pm - 3.50 pm)**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Andrew Dawson (Chairman)

Councillors Keith Butcher, Paul Dolan, Louise Gittins,  
Eveleigh Moore Dutton, Charles Fifield, Gordon Baxendale,  
Paul Edwards, Brian Silvester, Mo Grant, Wendy Clements,  
Patricia Glasman and Cherry Povall

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gill Boston, Carolyn Andrew and Ann Bridson

Reserve Member: Councillor Mo Grant

Visiting Member: Councillor Dorothy Flude

Officers in attendance:	Sheena Cumiskey	– Chief Executive
	Avril Devaney	– Director Of Nursing, Therapies and Patient Partnership
	Penny Housley	– Senior Manager-Overview and Scrutiny
	Deborah Ridgeley	– Democratic Services Officer

## **22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members did not declare any personal or prejudicial interests.

## **23 MINUTES**

**DECIDED: That**

the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

## **24 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

The Committee considered the report of the Cheshire and Wirral Partnership's Chief Executive, which provided an overview of activity since the last meeting.

Members were informed that following the unannounced visits by the Care Quality Commission (CQC), moderate concerns had been raised at Kent House and Greenways. It was stressed that there was no evidence of any patient being harmed, and the safeguarding concerns raised related to an individual who had made unsubstantiated allegations and there had been a delay in the reporting of this. Members enquired into how the results differed from Greenways achieving an "excellent" accreditation by the Royal College of Psychiatrists (RCP) Adult Inpatient Mental Health Service Accreditation Process AIMS. It was explained that the one service had been reviewed in two different ways. The CQC inspection took a "snapshot" of the Centre at the time of the visit, whilst the RCP took a more systematic approach to examine the way the Centre was being run.

Reference was also given to The Operating Framework for the NHS for 2012/2013 and the Quality Innovation Productivity and Prevention (QIPP) Level 2 Health Economy Savings.

Sheena Cumiskey then referred to the Member Engagement Events, which consisted of 3 half day events entitled “No Decision about me without me”, and of the disappointing turnout at the one event held on 18 January 2012. Councillors were invited to suggest ways of improving attendance at events, and the following were suggested:-

- Hold the event in a more public area, such as a market or shopping centre
- Hold the events at different times, they were often held during the day when people could be working; and
- Hold the event in a more central location within the Boroughs, the locations chosen were at the “extremity” of the local authority areas.

Members were reminded that the events were targeted at Board Members and interest groups. The CWP also attended other meetings to raise awareness, such as the Youth Parliament.

The recently launched television campaign regarding mental health at work was highlighted, and it was described as a national campaign to try and reduce discrimination at work, which did have an impact on services by raising awareness. Historical evidence had shown that during a recession, people did suffer from depression and anxiety and that had to be considered as part of the planning for service demand.

### **DECIDED: That**

the report be noted.

## **25 FUTURE INPATIENT SERVICE CONFIGURATION**

The Committee considered a report updating Members on the future inpatient service configurations, which had been requested at the last meeting. It was anticipated that the Estates Strategy would be revised over the next 3 months and a further report to outline the development proposals and challenges in service configuration to the Joint Scrutiny Committee’s next meeting in April.

Members were informed that a Strategic Estates Partner had been appointed and a Joint Venture had been established. It was through the Joint Venture that it was hoped the Trust would be able to access funding sources unavailable via traditional routes. A tendering process would have to be followed in compliance with the Official Journal of the European Union, which would be completed by the end of 2012. Alternative venues for providing services were always explored, and where possible, sharing accommodation with other health providers was encouraged as it promoted joint working and was considered to be a better use of space.

Members welcomed the update.

### **DECIDED: That**

the update be noted.

**26 QUALITY ACCOUNTS: PATIENT SAFETY PRIORITY FOR 2011/12 - PROGRESS**

Avril Devaney, Head of Nursing, referred Members to the progress report which set out the Quality Account assurance process. Members were reminded of the aim of the inpatient safety metrics programme, which was to undertake an ongoing check of patient safety issues common to all 22 inpatient wards in order to regularly monitor performance in these areas. It was reported that there were no nationally set metrics for mental health, so the tables enclosed in the report were established locally.

Members expressed concern at the improvement percentages provided in the report, and requested more detail with regard to the starting point, as it appeared some services had seen an improvement of 600%, which alarmed Members as to the size of the improvement. Members queried the presentation of the information and suggested that it could have been presented as a Red Amber Green (RAG) system, which would alert Members to the main area of concern.

The Committee were informed that the CWP Board received this information as a RAG rated document, and this too had caused concern. Members were reminded that there was no established standard tool for recording this, and the production of this information would then become the benchmark for future comparisons. The Chairman requested that the detail behind the improvements be emailed to Members to aid their understanding of the results presented in the report.

**DECIDED: That**

the report be noted.

**27 7 DAY FOLLOW UP PROGRESS**

Members considered the report of the Head of Performance and Information which provided an explanation as to the drop in performance in relation to the 7 day follow-up, highlighted at the last meeting.

It was reported that due to an issue with manually recorded data, this information in the July 2011 report was incorrect. An internal task and finish group had been established to oversee a move away from a manual process of collecting this information which is now fully automated.

**DECIDED: That**

the update and explanation provided be noted.

**28 CWP NHS TRUST SUICIDE PREVENTION STRATEGY**

The Committee considered recently developed CWP NHS Trust Suicide Prevention Strategy, and were referred to the 6 objectives set out in the report, which were outlined:-

Objective 1 – to work in partnership with public and private agencies and organisations to prevent and reduce suicide rates in our population

Objective 2 – to target high risk groups to prior reduction in harm and effective recovery strategies

Objective 3 – to promote and endeavour to provide a safe environment for our patients

Objective 4 – to have high quality risk assessment and management as part of the effective care planning for all our patients

Objective 5 – to have appropriately trained and competent staff to ensure effective suicide awareness and prevention; and

Objective 6 – to ensure that there are robust processes in place within the trust to learn lessons identified nationally, regionally and locally from confidential enquiries, national patient safety alerts, serious untoward incidents etc.

Members discussed the Strategy and were informed that reviews would be required due to the production of a new national strategy and the formation of the Health and Wellbeing Board, which would become a local authority responsibility from 2013. The CWP would be targeting their resources towards the individuals currently receiving their services, but were aware that not everyone who commits suicide has mental health issues.

Members enquired if anyone had committed suicide and had mental health issues but were not known to CWP would there be any way of finding this out. It was reported that when the Coroner recorded a death by suicide, or an open verdict, the CWP were not always requested to provide information so were not automatically aware of an individual's circumstances. When the CWP was asked to provide a report, this information guided the budget for support for the following financial year.

Members enquired if consideration had been given to the bereaved family members or friends, and if any support mechanisms were available. It was confirmed that this was contained in the Strategy, and took either an informal or formal approach, depending on the preferences of the individuals concerned. The work carried out by other agencies and connections with partner organisations was outlined in the Implementation Plan, appended to the report, and this recognised that the issue was not just a CWP issue, and that the wider community played an important role.

Objective 3 of the Strategy was referred to, and Members were informed that discharge from inpatient care did present issues for patients going from a hospital environment to home. Families were involved in care planning, where this was permitted by the patient. The subject of discharge was mentioned early in the care if a patient. CWP was involved in a national piece of work entitled "The Triangle of Care", which emphasised the importance of family involvement.

The Chairman suggested that a regular report be submitted to the Joint Committee and it was debated whether this should be quarterly, or based on which information as the reports from the National Confidential Enquirer were usually 12 – 18 months out of date. This would be debated further at the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

Members thanked the officers for their report and full debate.

**DECIDED: That**

- (i) the report be noted;

- (ii) the most appropriate reporting mechanism be discussed at the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

## **29 TASK GROUPS - PROGRESS**

Members were reminded of the three Task Groups established at an earlier meeting of the Committee, and that two had met since the last meeting. The topics covered were Community Treatment Orders and Alcohol Acquired Brain Injury, which were filmed and copies of the DVD and sound file were available, along with the Powerpoint presentations used at the groups.

Members welcomed the first meetings of the Task Groups and it was suggested that due to problems with availability, a date be arranged for the outstanding Group and make it available for anyone who is able to attend. This would also be filmed, and the DVD would be available after the Group.

### **DECIDED: That**

The update be noted and the remaining Task Group be arranged for mid-February 2012.

## **30 FUTURE OF THE CHESHIRE AND WIRRAL JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Members considered a tabled document concerning suggestions for the future of the Cheshire and Wirral Joint Scrutiny Committee. The document set out the issues that arose from the telephone conference held between the Chairman and the spokesperson.

Members held a detailed discussion about the Joint Scrutiny Committee and the value placed on the Committee by the CWP. Sheena Cumiskey confirmed that she found the Joint Committee to be valuable as it raised the profile of their work and enabled them, through discussion, to improve services and maintain close working with the local authorities of their footprint. The Joint Committee were reminded that the CWP was not alone in being a service provider for mental health, and that the other service providers would be welcome to also attend meetings to discuss service provision.

It was reported that any changes suggested to the remit of the Joint Committee would need to be considered by the three local authorities. A variation in numbers was also discussed, and any changes to this would also require agreement by the three authorities, and the corresponding impact on proportionality. The impact of the changes within the NHS would also have to be considered, with the transfer of the Health and Wellbeing function to local authorities from 2013 and the role of the Joint Committee and the Joint Commissioning Committee.

### **DECIDED: That**

the update be noted.

## **31 PROVISIONAL DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

### **DECIDED: That**

the dates for future meetings be noted as 16 April 2012, 9 July 2012, 21 January 2013 and 15 April 2013.

Chairman .....

Date .....

## CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

### Committee – Adult Social Care Scrutiny

---

**Date of Meeting:** 15 March 2012  
**Report of:** Children, Families and Adults Directorate  
**Subject/Title:** Progress Report on the Adults Local Account

---

#### 1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 This report is an update to the report received by this committee on 22nd November 2011 and to inform the committee on progress with the production of the Local Account for Adults who are in receipt or may require Social Care intervention.

#### 1.2 Background

The Government announced changes to the way that council adult social care services are assessed. Previously, councils were assessed each year by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and through the council's performance against a list of national targets (the National Indicator Set) published annually. Both the Annual Performance Assessment by the CQC and the National Indicator Set are to end.

In their place, the government has put forward the following:

##### Local Account

This would be a document published by the council on how it believes it has made progress on achieving its goals for adult social care over the past year.

##### Outcome Measures

These will be published nationally each year on how each council has performed against a number of different measures so that both councils and local people can compare progress on outcomes that are being achieved. These would also be published within the Local Account.

The aim of the Local Account is to support transparency at a local level by providing a means for councils and citizens to scrutinise progress against priorities and outcomes achieved.

### 1.3 Local Account Progress Update March 2012:

#### **CEC Approach**

We have a 'Local Account Steering Group' to oversee the development of the Local Account. Membership is drawn from various teams: Adults Performance; Communications; Individual Commissioning; Consultation and Participation; and Contracts. External participation includes attendance by Cheshire East LINK, Fifty Plus Network and Central and Eastern Cheshire Primary Care Trust (PCT).

The Steering Group agreed that, since the Local Account is intended as a document local people can use to hold the Council to Account, it should reflect their priorities and be in a format that is meaningful to them. There were three main ways that views of local people were collected:

- A specific Local Account question within the Annual Adult Social Care Survey asking people what they thought was most important about adult social care.
- A questionnaire on what things we should include within the Local Account and how these should be best measured and presented. There were two versions of the questionnaire; one designed for completion by individuals, the other for organisations including: Voluntary Community and Faith Sector, User Representative Groups and Equality Groups.
- Focus group work and face-to-face interviews with service users and carers which asked people about what adult social care should be striving for and specific questions about what the Local Account structure, content, format and distribution should be.

#### **Recommendations for the content, structure and format of the Local Account**

The Local Account Steering Group have now considered the results from the engagement exercise and have put forward the proposed recommendations on the content, structure and format of the Local Account based on this feedback. The proposed recommendations can be found in Appendix 1.

#### **Timetable**

We are hopeful that we will be in a position to publish the first Local Account in summer 2012. The following is a general guide to the time frames of the various phases involved:-

Phase 4 – Draft Framework for Local Account: March 2012 – April 2012

Phase 5 – Production and Publication of First Local Account: April 2012 – July 2012

#### **National Update**

All authorities are currently working on their Local Accounts for 2011/12. National support and sharing of good practice on Local Accounts will be part of the 'Towards Excellence in Councils' Adult Social Care' programme led by the Local Government Group (LGG) and the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS).



Sharing and updating on development of Local Accounts has also been undertaken on a regional basis through the North West Performance Leads (NWPL) forum which also feeds in to ADASS North West.

## **2.0 Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the Adult Social Care Scrutiny note progress on the Local Account development.
- 2.2 That the Adult Social Care Scrutiny identify when a further progress report will be required.

## **3.0 Reasons for Recommendations**

- 3.1 The Local Account is designed to be the window to our service and give the citizens of Cheshire East a say in how their social care service is shaped; it is a mechanism to monitor CEC performance in a way which increases awareness and insight leading to increased satisfaction and transparency.

## **4.0 Wards and Local Ward Members Affected**

- 4.1 All

## **5.0 Policy Implications**

- 5.1 The Local Account will support Corporate Objective 5 of the Corporate Plan: "Being an excellent Council and working with others – to deliver for Cheshire East". It will provide transparency and accountability to residents on performance of adult social care and demonstrate progress on joint working arrangements. The Local Account will also help to demonstrate progress against a number of the priorities for action detailed in the Sustainable Communities Strategy and in particular priority action 6: 'Prepare for an increasingly older population'

## **6.0 Financial Implications**

- 6.1 A modest budget has been identified for the production and dissemination of the Local Account in 2012/13 which will be met from within the services budget.

## **7.0 Legal Implications**

- 7.1 The Local Account proposals are not currently part of any legislation.

## **8.0 Risk Management**

- 8.1 Risk management will be overseen by the Local Account Steering Group. The main risk identified is that the Local Account is not seen as a credible document by residents. The engagement process with residents and

representative organisations to develop the Local Account will help to mitigate against such a risk with the intention that the content reflects the themes and priorities raised by them. Making the Local Account part of an ongoing process of transparency and accountability rather than just being an annual document will also help to reduce this risk.

## **9.0 Background and Options**

- 9.1 The details of the initial government proposals were presented to the Scrutiny Committee meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011 and an update on progress was presented at the meeting of 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2011. The Department of Health published its formal response to the consultation on proposals on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011. In the response no further guidance was included on Local Accounts other than to confirm the proposals already published. It stated that ADASS and the Local Government Group (LGG) would be taking this forward to identify potential good practice as part of their work on the wider sector-led improvement model. The local implementation for Cheshire East to date is detailed under section 1.0 above.

## **10.0 Access to Information**

- 10.1 The Government proposals on Local Accounts and Outcome Measures are part of the Department of Health consultation document 'Transparency in Outcomes: a framework for adult social care':

[http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Consultations/Liveconsultations/DH\\_121509](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Consultations/Liveconsultations/DH_121509)

The government response to the consultation on Local Account and Outcome Measure was published on 31 March 2011 in the Department of Health document 'Transparency in outcomes: a framework for quality in adult social care - response to consultation':

[http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Consultations/Responsestoconsultations/DH\\_125464](http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Consultations/Responsestoconsultations/DH_125464)

## **Appendix 1**



Appendix 1 Local  
Account Recommend:

**Name: Dave Caldwell**  
**Designation: Senior Information Manager**  
**Tel No: 01270 686287**  
**Email: [david.caldwell@cheshireeast.gov.uk](mailto:david.caldwell@cheshireeast.gov.uk)**



This page is intentionally left blank

**As of 07/03/2012**

**Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee: September 2011 – April 2012**

**Portfolio Holder – Roland Domleo**

### **Historical Record**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Agenda Setting Meeting</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Purpose/Key issues (including origin)</b>	<b>Comments post meeting</b>
20 July 2011	11 July 2011	Disabled Facilities Grant and Home Improvement Grant	A review of Home Improvement Agency services was carried out in 2010 with a view to streamlining the service into 1 service across Cheshire East, to improve delivery of Disabled Facilities Grants. A procurement process has been undertaken and once tenders have been evaluated a report will be submitted to Cabinet either recommending awarding a contract, or recommending bringing the service in-house. This is very much tied up with adult social care redesign, and the HIA is the main delivery agent for the Disabled Facilities Grants.	That the Committee receive robust figures in terms of the potential cost savings as a result of DFGs at a future meeting in order for a potential case to be constructed for increasing Cheshire East's budget contribution and to have conversations with health partners regarding match funding.
		Think Local Act Personal – A National Strategy for Local Implementation	To consider the strategy prior to Cabinet decision on 1 August 2011.	That it be recommended to the Director of Adults, Community, Health and Wellbeing that alternative means be sought in terms of communicating information about Adult Social Care services to the public alongside the on-

				<p>line citizen portal.</p> <p>That the Committee continue to monitor the personalisation agenda to assess its effectiveness for vulnerable people.</p> <p>That the Committee receive regular updates on the Adult Social Care service, including allocated budget, spend and impact on service users.</p>
		Adult Social Care Budget	To receive a verbal brief outlining pressure points on budget	<p>That the Committee review the efficacy of the six week free support policy at a future meeting.</p> <p>That the Committee consider an item on 'invest to save' policies at every formal meeting, the results of which to be potentially fed into the Budget Task and Finish Group.</p>
22 September 2011	11 July 2011	Management Structure Update	To receive verbal brief	That the Committee receive a detailed breakdown of the adults' budget, including statutory and discretionary (ring fenced and non ring fenced) elements and information on overspend and under spend.
		Ofsted Inspection of Safeguarding and looked after children services	To consider the report	That the number relating to the percentage of households with Adult Mental Health issues with children present be circulated to the Committee for information.

				<p>That in six months, the Strategic Director bring back the following to the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Progress made against areas for improvement relevant to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee with measurable and time related outcomes.</li> <li>b) Information on the further steps that were taken to demonstrate Cheshire East's ambition to become at least good if not outstanding in the forthcoming years.</li> </ul> <p>That it be noted that a consultation on the inspection framework was being undertaken by OFSTED.</p>
		Q1 Performance/Finance Report		<p>That the Quarter 1 Performance/Finance Report be brought to a future meeting.</p> <p>That for future meetings, the budget report presented to Cabinet be brought to Scrutiny with a report outlining the potential implications and reasons behind the figures.</p>
		Strategy for Carers in East Cheshire 2011-15	Members to consider the strategy	<p>That the Strategy for Carer's 2011-2015 be noted.</p> <p>That progress on the implementation plan be brought back to the Committee</p>

				<p>in six months time and this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Measureable and time-related outcomes</li> <li>b) Progress on the development and efficacy of an inter-agency dialogue process to flag up issues regarding young carers' needs.</li> </ul> <p>That it be recommended to Cabinet that they lobby the government and local MPs for more respite provision for carers and for perverse benefit outcomes to be stopped.</p> <p>That the point concerning supporting carers once they stop being a carer be fed to the Carer's Interagency Group and that the result of this be circulated to the Committee.</p>
		Care Quality Commission		<p>That the presentation be noted</p> <p>That the Committee join the CQC national sounding board.</p>
		Work Programme update		<p>That a Task and Finish Review on the future arrangements/provision of residential care be established with the following Membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Councillor Peter Raynes</li> <li>b) Councillor Laura Jeuda</li> <li>c) Councillor Frank Keegan</li> <li>d) Councillor Dorothy Flude</li> </ul>



				<p>e) Councillor Irene Faseyi</p> <p>That the Quarter 2 Performance/Finance report be added to the work programme and for it to include emerging budget proposals for 2012/13.</p> <p>That a full structure chart be distributed to the Committee.</p>
27 October 2011		Briefing Report on the financial position of the Adults Social Care Budget.	Members to consider	<p>That the report be noted</p> <p>That Lucia Scally bring back any available information to the Committee with regards to the work that was being undertaken to inform self funders about their care options.</p> <p>That Lucia Scally bring back information on what the service was doing in terms of analysing the potential number of self funders returning to Cheshire East care and the impacts of this as part of the next budgetary report</p> <p>That the Committee receive a ½ day training session on the Adult Services budget to firstly provide a foundation on how the Adult Social care budget was formulated and secondly to go over the number of areas of possible interest, including:</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detail on growth pressures (e.g. older people and learning disabilities) and policies aimed to mitigate this (e.g. re-ablement)</li> <li>• Care4CE – the shift from internal provision to Direct Payments and external provision and the impact of this.</li> <li>• Comparisons with other local authorities to explore whether we are getting value for money and whether they have different growth pressures</li> </ul> <p>That the Committee receive regular quarterly budget reports.</p>
		Work Programme.	To be considered and amended as appropriate	<p>That the work programme be noted</p> <p>That an item on the Empower Card be brought to a subsequent Committee as soon as possible.</p> <p>That a Q2 performance and finance report be brought to the informal meeting scheduled for the 21 December 2011.</p> <p>That the Scrutiny Officer make enquiries regarding the attendance of Cheshire East MPs at an Adult Social Care Committee meeting.</p>

22 November 2011		PROGRESS REPORT ON THE ADULTS LOCAL ACCOUNT	To be considered	<p>That the progress on the Local Account development be noted.</p> <p>That a further progress report be brought to the Committee once the findings from stage 1 are collated and that this report also include information on the way forward for stage 2.</p>
		UP-DATE REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF ADULT SERVICES TRANSPORT	To be considered	<p>That the report be noted.</p> <p>That an update report be brought back to a future meeting and that this include information on the programme roll out in the Macclesfield and Wilmslow areas and information on the potential and actualised savings following the implementation of the programme as a whole.</p>
		INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION PROGRAMME	To be considered	<p>That the proposal to form a steering group to oversee work required to develop the Adults Information and Communication Programme be supported and that informal Member input to this group be sought from the Cabinet Support Member and Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>That the work streams of the Information and Communication Steering Group be supported.</p> <p>That a training session for Members on effective communication to adult service users be provided in the near</p>

				<p>future.</p> <p>That a demonstration of the Information Gateway, Digital TV and Demenshare be brought to the next meeting scheduled 21 December 2011.</p>
21 December 2011		CABINET REPORT – IMPROVEMENTS IN THE DELIVERY OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE SERVICES – BUILDING BASED SERVICES	To be considered	<p>That the report be noted</p> <p>That thanks be extended to the officers for implementing such a comprehensive consultation process.</p> <p>That a further report, outlining the consultation responses be brought to the Committee on 28 February 2012.</p> <p>That representations be made to Cabinet when they receive the final report regarding the disjoint between assets and adult social care which had a part to play in delaying the review thereby negating any potential savings for 2011/12.</p> <p>That Jill Greenwood explore the queries with regard to Macclesfield Leisure Centre and that the</p>

				response be circulated to the Committee for information
		ADULT SOCIAL CARE FINANCIAL SUMMARY	To be considered	<p>That the report be noted</p> <p>That a report be submitted to the Committee on the 18 January 2012 outlining the proposed savings/pressures for 2012/13 and what the policy implications of these might be.</p> <p>That the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care be invited to attend the meeting on 18 January 2012.</p>
		WORK PROGRAMME	To be considered	<p>That a performance report be brought to the meeting in March 2012.</p> <p>That subsequent meetings be scheduled for 10am rather than 10.30am.</p>
18 January 2012		ADULT SOCIAL CARE BUDGET - UPDATE ON 2011/12 OUTTURN	To be considered	<p>That the report be received.</p> <p>That a further budget paper be brought to the next meeting of the Committee and that this include:</p> <p>a) Further information on projected transport savings</p>

				b) Further information on the work on-going around re-ablement.
		DISABLED FACILITIES GRANT	To be considered	That the presentation be noted.
		WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE		<p>That the work programme be noted.</p> <p>That the Scrutiny Officer distribute both the Adult Social Care and Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee agendas to the Membership of both Committees in order to help identify cross-cutting issues.</p> <p>That the next informal meeting be re-scheduled to a date prior to 23<sup>rd</sup> February so that comment can be passed on the draft business plan before Full Council.</p>

**Next Agenda Setting Meeting: tba**

## **Ongoing items/reviews/Monitoring Papers**

Item	Reporting:	Committee Meeting							
		22/9	27/10	22/11	21/12	18/1	28/2	15/3	17/4
Safeguarding	When appropriate								
Performance/Finance report	Quarterly		X		X			X	
The Cheshire and Wirral Councils' Joint Scrutiny Committee	Monitor minutes of meetings when appropriate		X					X	

## **Possible Future Issues / Items (Chronology)**

**Meeting dates:**

**? April 2012 (informal), 9 May 2012**

Item	Corporate Priority / Targets	Notes	Suggested Action	Due Date and Status
Carers Strategy	Prepare for an increasingly older population	Following from report in September 2011 – Committee to follow up on actions. Review of implementation plan.		<b>April 2011</b> <b>On track</b>
OFSTED Report – Safeguarding and Looked After children services	Support our children and young people		Committee to receive	<b>April 2011</b> <b>On track</b>

### **Items to be considered:**

- Wishing Well (post Age Concern)
- Commissioning Strategy/Whole System Commissioning – GP Consortia Pilot
- Development of a protocol for informing the public about changes in social care arrangements
- Charging policy
- New Dementia Unit and Hollins View – Business Case
- Personalisation agenda
- Local Involvement Network (LiNK) – Work Programme; Future arrangements and transition to Local Healthwatch

### **Training Requirements/Site Visits:**

- Explanation of Department functions along with emerging policy context for ASC – **tba – part of special meeting April 2012?**
- Effective communication with regards to adult services

### **Disregarded / Discontinued Items**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Understanding the personalisation agenda	11/07/2011	Included in 'Think Local, Act Personal' item
Support for Carers	11/08/2011	Superseded by Carers Strategy
Understanding the 'lifestyle concept' including lifestyle centres	14/09/2011	To be considered by H&WB Committee
Review of the efficiency of people who self fund social care	07.10.2011	To be considered as part of the residential provision T&F review.



### **Task Groups – potential/current/completed**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Dementia Services	Postponed due to election. Agreed to continue the work of the T&F group	Reconvened – expected to report
Future Arrangements/Provision of Residential Care	<p>At the meeting of the Council on 21 April 2011 a Notice of Motion had been submitted by Councillors D Flude and C Thorley regarding instability in the residential care market in Cheshire East and its potential impact on the finances of the Council. It was requested that a Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Group be set up to determine the best means of managing demand for residential care including demand from returning self funders.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the matter be referred to the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee with a view to them examining the matter and reporting back on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stability of the residential care market in Cheshire East</li> <li>• The availability of residential care at affordable prices in Cheshire East</li> <li>• The success or otherwise of current measures to manage the demand for residential care in Cheshire East.</li> <li>• The success or otherwise of measures to support self funders to remain independent of Council funding for longer</li> </ul>	Membership agreed 22/9.

#### **Dates of Future Cabinet Meetings**

2 April 2012 and 30 April 2012.

#### **Dates of Future Council Meetings**

19 April 2012 and 16 May 2012.

This page is intentionally left blank