



CABINET

9 NOVEMBER 2016

**DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND MANAGING DIRECTOR OF OLYMPUS
CARE SERVICES: DR CAROLYN KUS**

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT CARE DELIVERY: COUNCILLOR BILL PARKER

Subject:	Utilising Block Residential Care Contracts - to Facilitate Greater Choice
Recommendations:	<p>The Cabinet is asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the contents of the report. 2. To approve the commencement of a consultation process on the proposals set out in this report, and then further report the results of the consultation to a future meeting of Cabinet for consideration and decision. 3. To receive a further report to Cabinet on the proposals set out in this report once appropriate Financial and Legal Advice has been received.

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 Cabinet are asked to agree a 6 week consultation is undertaken with relevant shareholders and stakeholders to change the use of Shaw beds to provide longer term support for older people and those with dementia including respite care and short stay.
- 1.2 The major changes which Cabinet are being asked to consider is for those service users who are deemed eligible for social care the block contracts will be offered as a first choice.

2. How this decision contributes to the Council Plan

The Council's vision is to make Northamptonshire a great place to live and work. This is achieved through increasing the wellbeing of your county's communities and/or safeguarding the county's communities.

This initiative specifically delivers increased wellbeing and/or safeguarding by ensuring that:

- Resources are utilised effectively and efficiently, in coordination with partners and providers.

3. Background

- 3.1 We currently have a long standing PFI contract with Shaw for the provision of 3 specialist care centres and 152 beds. Currently these beds are used for step down facility to accommodate hospital discharges where appropriate
- 3.2 When the contract was entered into some 10+ years ago the service user group was considerably different to those of today, and we are seeing a rise in people with

complex needs particularly with people with dementia.

3.3 As our demographics have changed and we have seen the level of demand increase we need to consider the future usage of these block contracts and how these can be better used.

3.4 Making best use of our resources is key to our finances and we have taken the opportunity to review the usage of the Shaw bed occupancy and after discussions with NHS colleagues have found these beds, which are specified for individuals with less complex needs are significantly underused, as currently there is a 48% vacancy level. This clearly does not demonstrate good value for money. We would therefore like to consult with customers who use our residential services, their families and partners to offer these beds as the first choice for residential care.

4. Consultation and Scrutiny

It is proposed to undertake a six week consultation, we will also seek legal advice to ensure we remain compliant with the Care Act 2015.

5. Equality Screening

Reason that no EqIA is required	as appropriate
The paper is for information only	
The proposal/activity/decision has no impact on customers or the service they receive	
The proposal impacts upon staff but the proposed staffing changes will not affect the service that customers receive*	
Other (please explain further)	we will complete and include as part of the consultation exercise

* where a proposal affects staff, the appropriate HR processes will be followed, which have already been subject to the EqIA process and will be compliant with HR legislation

6. Alternative Options Considered

6.1 None

7. Financial Implications

The potential financial implications arising from this proposal will form part of the Medium Term Financial Plan. An indicative target saving of £1.7m in 2017-18 has been put into the financial forecast. A detailed cost benefit analysis will be worked up based on the outcomes of the consultation.

8. Risk and Business Continuity Management

8.1) Risk(s) associated with the proposal

Risk	Mitigation	Residual Risk
People could have their service stopped and reduced	A detailed check list will be completed agreement to stop services can only be signed off at Director Level after all relevant checks have been carried out by an Assistant Director.	Amber

8.2) Risk(s) associated with not undertaking the proposal

Risk	Risk Rating
Individual client debt will increase, which will place an added burden on the council	Red

9. List of Appendices

None.

Author:	Name: Dr Carolyn Kus Team: Adult Social Care
Contact details:	Tel: 01604 367670 Email: ckus@northamptonshire.gov.uk
Background Papers:	
Does the report propose a key decision is taken?	YES
If yes, is the decision in the Forward Plan?	YES
Will further decisions be required? If so, please outline the timetable here	
Does the report include delegated decisions? If so, please outline the timetable here	
Is this report proposing an amendment to the budget and/or policy framework?	YES
Have the financial implications been cleared by the Strategic Finance Manager (SFM)?	YES Name of SFM: Yalini Gunarajah
Have any capital spend implications been cleared by the Capital Investment Board (CIB)?	NO
Has the report been cleared by the relevant Director?	YES Name of Director: Dr Carolyn Kus
Has the relevant Cabinet Member been consulted?	Yes Cabinet Member: Councillor Bill Parker
Has the relevant scrutiny committee been consulted?	NO Scrutiny Committee:

Has the report been cleared by Legal Services?	NO Solicitor's comments:
Have any communications issues been cleared by Communications and Marketing?	YES Name of officer: Joni Ager
Have any property issues been cleared by Property and Asset Management?	NO Name of officer:
Are there any community safety implications?	These will be considered and taken into account as each service or proposal is put through the framework
Are there any environmental implications:	These will be considered and taken into account as each service or proposal is put through the framework
Are there any Health & Safety Implications:	NO
Are there any Human Resources Implications:	NO
Are there any human rights implications:	NO
Constituency Interest:	NO