# **EIT - Gateway Review of Adult Operational Services**

## **Arts, Leisure and Culture Select Committee**

### **Baseline Information Challenge**

This took place at a meeting of the Committee on 15 July 2009.

Members were presented with the baseline information that was divided into the following services:

- Day Care
- Residential Care Home
- In-House Home Care
- Intermediate Services
- Independent Provision of Home Care

The Committee agreed with the planned way forward for the review, as outlined by the officer project team. This consisted of a focus on the following areas: Day Care, Residential Care, and In-House Home Care.

### 1. Day Care

Alma Centre – decision needed on future location of services based here due to development of integrated health centre on same site.

Personalisation – this agenda and increased personal choice in the type of care provided will have an impact on the numbers entering the more traditional types of day care services.

STEPS at Tithebarn – original aim of this service was to provide personal development for adults with physical disabilities/ sensory loss, in order to raise their aspirations. Currently those using the service do not fit the original aims and a decision needs to be made on future direction of the service.

### 2. Residential Care Homes

The Rosedale Home is viewed as remaining to be fit for purpose. The review will concentrate on the future of Blenheim House. This provides services for adults with physical disabilities; however the building is no longer regarded as being fit for purpose, and due to the mix of clients that currently reside there it is not a suitable environment for all their needs. There is a general drive towards providing care in clients' own homes wherever possible in order to promote independent living. Blenheim also provides care to clients from across the former Cleveland County, and so is subject to their placement policies.

#### 3. In-House Home Care

The review provides an opportunity to look at closer working between the inhouse home care service and the Intermediate Care Service, due to the similar nature of work undertaken. More flexible working arrangements have already been introduced, and the service has improved services with a view to gaining an improved rating following a re-inspection (inspection scheduled for August 2009).

The Committee were content that the Council was receiving good value for money in terms of independently provided residential care home placements, and that the scope for efficiencies was not as apparent in terms of the Intermediate Care Service (aside from the links with the In-House Home Care as mentioned above), and the Independent Home Care. This has recently been reviewed, with contracts aligned with the Adult Operational Integrated Service Areas. Therefore the focus of the review was best placed on the three areas outlined above.

Members were keen to stress the following general points:

- There must be strong communication between the Adult Operations review and the review of Fair Access to Care Services Review (FACS);
- Consultation with affected clients must be thorough and timely throughout the process, especially in relation to Blenheim House in view of the potential changes to service delivery for clients currently in residence;
- The monitoring of the standard of care provided by independent providers must continue to be robust;
- The emphasis on individual choice was to be welcomed, especially in relation to Day Care Services, and that this reflected the changing needs and demands of the population.

A number of supplementary questions were raised by Members and the officer team provided comprehensive information in response, following the meeting.

### **Options Challenge**

The Committee took part in a site visit on 6 January. The visit provided the opportunity for Members to visit the following sites: Blenheim House, Parkside House, Halcyon Centre, Alma House, and STEPS at Tithebarn. Members found that the visit was beneficial and greatly helped improve their understanding of the issues under consideration. Members were grateful for the help of staff and clients during the visit.

The Committee received the options report at a meeting of 17 February. As agreed at the previous meeting, the report focussed on three main areas:

### 1. Day Care and STEPS at Tithebarn

Members noted that the options in relation to day care were set within the context of personalisation and the promotion of choice for current and future clients. Current demands for day care services remains relatively stable, however services in the future will be in response to the wishes of individual clients. Members made the following observations:

- Members requested reassurance in relation to the day care type provision that was being made for the projected rise in the older population. It was noted that a range of options would need to be retained as it was not yet possible to know what services clients would choose.
- Members were keen to ensure that future types of service provision would include options that ensured that clients had access to opportunities for social interaction (but noted that the actual shape of services was subject to further work and would be subject to demand).
- Members noted the move away from traditional day care, and the need to secure community involvement with schemes such as the Halcyon Centre. It was noted that extra care facilities provide a range of facilities for the local community as well as scheme residents.
- The Committee were content that the service currently provided at Tithebarn was not meeting the original aims for this strand of the STEPS programme. It had been intended that Tithebarn would provide an enabling service in order to assist adults with a disability develop skills including literacy and communication in order for them to enter further education or employment, however the client group had remained static and the centre was acting similar to traditional day care.

The Committee has requested that it receives the results of the consultation with users of Parkside and STEPS ahead of their consideration by Cabinet.

### 2. Care Home Services – Blenheim House and Rosedale House

Members noted that in relation to Blenheim House the consultation process would allow the Council to seek the views of both clients and the former Cleveland County local authorities who had placed clients at the home. Members noted that alternative types of independent living provision were being developed however it was recognised that some clients may wish to stay in traditional residential care. Members made the following observations:

- The consultation process would need to be inclusive and sensitive to the needs of the affected clients.
- The consultation needed to include realistic examples of the future types of care that could be provided in order to ensure that clients can develop an informed opinion.
- Members noted the importance of housing provision and the strong links to adult social care strategy.

The Committee has requested that it receives the results of the consultation with clients of Blenheim House of their consideration by Cabinet.

Members were content with the proposals to further develop Rosedale as an enabling service.

#### 3. In House Home Care

Members were content with the proposals in relation to the in house home care service. Members noted that independent providers provide the majority of home care services in the Borough. Members were reassured in relation to the procedures in place for monitoring these contracts, and were keen to see that this continued.