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1. Introduction


Within the Next Generation Council model, NCC core functions are supported by a number of delivery vehicles that are separate from, but remain connected and accountable to NCC through appropriate governance arrangements. The delivery vehicles, commissioned by the Council, are a group of interdependent organisation and will focus on key strategic outcomes for Northamptonshire communities.

From the 5th January 2017 to 16th February 2017, the Council embarked on a public consultation about the new delivery vehicle for adult social care, called Northamptonshire Adult Social Care Services (NASS).

The Council wanted to hear the view from all interested parties to help inform and influence the design and development of NASS.

This report is an analysis of the information and data gathered from the six weeks of public consultation.

2. Background

In November 2016, the outline business case for the adult social care delivery vehicle was reported to the Council’s Cabinet meeting.

Within this business outline, the Council proposed a new organisational arrangement of delivering adult social care services, NASS, which would:

- Be a company limited by guarantee and wholly owned subsidiary of the Council.
- Directly deliver services, unless there is a need for highly specialist provision that is best provided by others. This will reduce the time and cost of external commissioning, removing the duplication of management costs, and give flexibility for swift change.
- Provide opportunities to form joint arrangements with health partners for services to specific customer groups or cohorts.
- Have the ability to trade and an opportunity to generate income. The Council already have a trading company called Olympus Care Services (OCS). OCS will be part of NASS and remain as a trading company. NASS will have the opportunity to develop on the already good foundations built by OCS for traded services. These services can be sold to other authorities to maximise income and incentivise the market. The name and brand of Olympus Care Services will be retained.
Be commissioned by the Council to deliver specified outcomes within a financial envelope and that NASS’s performance will be monitored and be reported to the Council.

Not transfer the accountability held by the Council to deliver its statutory and regulated functions for services to vulnerable eligible adults and their carers, nor would it remove the statutory accountabilities of the lead member for adult services, nor the Director for Adults Social Services (the DASS).

Furthermore the Council envisage that:

- There would be negligible change in service to the end user in the formation of the new vehicle.
- A final business case would be presented to its Cabinet in March 2017 and which would include consideration of the feedback received from public consultation.

Due to the potential organisational changes to the way in which the services of NCC and OCS are configured and managed, it is essential that existing and potential stakeholders - including current and future customers and their families and carers, service providers, partner organisations, and other key stakeholders - are informed, engaged and consulted with.

The consultation sought views on organisational modelling and/ or service development and future plans of NASS which would be considered as part of the final business case for NASS.

The consultation was conducted by the Engagement, Participation and Involvement Team within Northamptonshire County Council, who carried out the consultation in compliance with NCC’s Consultation and Engagement Policy and Standard of Required Practice.

The consultation was also supported and the methodology agreed by the Next Generation Project Board (NASS).

3. Consultation Methodology

The following outlines the consultation methods and events used to generate the material/ data for analysis.

A stakeholder analysis was completed. It identified stakeholders which included: users of the service, interested members of the public, providers and partners, stakeholder organisations, plus others.

Due to the breadth of potential stakeholders it was decided that provider and public consultation events were to be held to enable face-to-face dialogue, as well as an online questionnaire (A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix 5).
A number of qualitative and quantitative questions were asked on the questionnaire to gain an understanding of respondent’s views. The questionnaire was designed to:

- Inform the audience of the proposals.
- Gain an understanding of how well the concept of the new organisation is understood.
- Ascertain key gaps with the service provision which could also influence the development of NASS.
- Offer opportunity to be further involved in NASS development.
- Capture the demographic information of respondents.
- Details of the consultation, including the below was made available on a dedicated internet web page on NCC’s consultation register, www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/consultationregister, which is where all of the Council’s consultations are published.

- NASS Explanatory Note (PDF) (Appendix 4)
- Web link to November Cabinet Report
- Web link to Equality Impact Assessment
- Online questionnaire

An offer was made to translate the questionnaire into other formats, including easy read, however no requests were made for any translated versions.

The consultation and online questionnaire was also promoted to a number of key stakeholders, including:

- Users of the service (including OCS customers)
- Providers of social care services
- Health and Wellbeing Board Members and locality groups
- Members of Northamptonshire County Council’s Consultation Register
- Members of the County’s Residents’ Panel
- Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG)
- Healthwatch Northamptonshire
- County Councillors, local councils
- Carers Partnership
- Northamptonshire Learning Disability Partnership
- Northants 50+ Network
- Voluntary Sector
- Other interested parties

Key organisations, identified through the stakeholder analysis were also asked to help promote the consultation amongst their members and other distribution channels.
As well as being promoted via our partners’ communication channels, this consultation was also posted and publicised via the Council’s and OCS’s Facebook, Twitter and other social media accounts.

Northamptonshire’s Learning Disability Partnership Board supported the development of an easy read public facing slide pack.

Four public consultation events consisting of three public events and one specifically for providers and partners were held. The format of the events was the same, that being a presentation followed by a question and answer session. All presentations were delivered by a senior officer from NCC or from OCS. The Cabinet Member with responsibility for adult social care was present too at all of the events. At each event, a further opportunity to inform attendees to complete the online questionnaire and/or to make a written submission or to send further comment or questions was taken. At the provider and partner event a box was provided for attendees to post comments and questions.

All presentation material used at consultation events can be found at Appendix 6.

A self serve slide pack and response sheet were prepared and made available on request to enable interested stakeholders to facilitate their own discussions and submit feedback. (Appendix 7)

Respondents were also supplied with postal and email addresses for written responses to be submitted too.

During the consultation period a number of other consultations were being undertaken by the Council. This included the Draft Budget and Council Plan Budget Consultation 2017-18, consultation on Utilising Block Residential Care Contracts - to Facilitate Greater Choice, and the consultation on the Paying for Care and Support When Eligible for Adult Social Care document.

4. Summary of Feedback

This is an extensive summary of the feedback received and it is recommended that it is read in conjunction with the full results which can be found in appendices 1-3.

A wealth of feedback was received to this consultation and included comments and questions from the different groups of respondents – service customers, carers, interested members of the public and professionals.
4a Questionnaire feedback

A total of 102 questionnaire responses were received. When asked if respondents were responding as an individual or from an organisation, 91.21% of respondents were individuals, with 8.79% of respondents were from organisations. (11 respondents did not answer this question).

Respondents were asked to identify in what respect they were answering the question for example were they a customer, carer, employee of NCC etc. A number of options were provided and respondents were allowed to select more than one answer as it is recognised some people have multiple roles and responsibilities.

Of the 80 respondents that did answer 48.8% were either a current customer, relative or a friend of someone using NCC adult social care and or OCS. 42.5% of respondents identified themselves as a member of the public. 21.3% were members of staff at either NCC or OCS. A further 21.3% identified themselves as a councillor, a provider or a professional. Those that chose other mainly expressed that there were from the voluntary and or charity sector, with some expressing that they were past customers or potential future customer of the social care services and or carers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a current customer of NCC Adult Social Care and/ or</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympus Care Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a relative/ carer of someone using NCC Adult Social</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care and/ or Olympus Care Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a friend of someone using NCC Adult Social Care and/</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Olympus Care Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of the public</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of staff employed by Olympus Care Services</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of staff employed by Northamptonshire</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a Councillor</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a provider of adult social care services</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a professional e.g. GP, district nurse, etc</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to rate how well they understood what the Council is trying to achieve in setting up Northamptonshire Adult Social Services. The rating scale was 1 to 5, where 1 was stating that it was a “Very Unclear Understanding” and 5 stating a “Very Clear Understanding”. Respondents were then asked to state why they had given that rating.
41.8% of respondents who answered this question rated their understanding as either a 4 or 5 for its clarity. 29.0% gave a rating of either 1 or 2, indicating unclear. The total average score for clarity is 3.2 out of 5.

A total of 60 respondents of the 93 who answered the question explained their rationale behind their rating, although most of these responses were from people raising concerns or criticism about the proposals.

The most frequent comments received were about:

- Lack of clarity from the business case about how future service delivery will affect and/or benefit NCC and its customers.
- Not understanding what difference the proposals would actually make.
- The language being used was not plain English and inaccessible to the ‘lay’ person.
- Proposed budget cuts to adult social services, and the subsequent fear over the potential loss of services.

Some respondents expressed their dissatisfaction with the communication of the changes stating they were not made aware of the proposals or the consultation until recently and have struggled to find further information on the subject, with some questioning how customers and carers are being kept informed.

Concern was also raised about what the proposals mean for current providers other than OCS, with worries that NASS will treat OCS as the preferred provider at the detriment to other service providers.

In contrast a few respondents did state that they found the information published in the outline business case straightforward and understandable, with some thinking the proposals would reduce costs, provide greater value for money, and improve the service.
A respondent mentioned the governance structure and hoped there would be avoidance of duplication of senior management. Whilst another raised concern over the potential reduction of accountability and control.

Respondents were provided with an opportunity to make any other comments. A total of 23 respondents gave further comments. These responses varied and the following is a summary of the main themes.

Respondents made requests for more detailed and understandable information about how the proposals may affect them and the services delivered, as some felt the information provided to-date was too conceptual.

Others expressed concern over their fears of a conflict of interest and lack of choice and person centred planning for customers. In particular with brokerage giving priority to OCS as a preferred provider over other organisations, effectively limiting choice for the customer and putting other providers at a disadvantage.

A few of the respondents mentioned how highly they valued their existing service and expressed their desire that they remain unaffected by the proposals. Whilst a couple of respondents expressed their dissatisfaction with their current service and NCC.

Some respondents took this opportunity to express their disagreement with the proposals for a variety of reasons. Their stated concerns included: fear that customers and carers will suffer; a lack of community and voluntary sector support; NASS will not be accountable to public taxpayer; and that NASS will add another layer of management and bureaucracy.

74 responses were received when asked whether respondents would like to join the NASS customer reference group. 32.4% replied “Yes” and supplied their contact details.
4b Consultation Events

Four consultation events were arranged and advertised through the Council’s consultation register. OCS, with other stakeholders, helped promote the consultation which included promotion of these events. The rationale for holding these events was to enable a face-to-face dialogue between senior council decision makers and stakeholders.

The Partners and Providers Event was held in NCC’s Council Chamber on the 27th January. Due to numbers of people registering their interest to attend this session was split into two so all organisations could be accommodated. Each session was delivered in the same style and format. Presentation material was made available to all attendees.

The three Public Events were open meetings for customers, members of the public and others interested stakeholders. These were held in OCS venues in the north, south and centre of the county (Corby, Towcester and Northampton).

NCC officers provided answers to questions and comments raised at the events. Feedback from all consultation events is provided at Appendix 2.

Key summary feedback points are provided below.

Provider and Partner Consultation Event

A total of 88 provider and or partner representatives attended this event, which was split over two one hour sessions. The graphic below helps to illustrate the key words used by attendees.
Most of their questions and comments focused on:

- Concerns on the governance and accountability of NASS and OCS. These included asking what framework agreements existed, how transparent would its operations be; who would share from a profit made, would making a profit be a primary function.
- OCS becoming a provider of first choice by the NCC over other providers. How equitable and transparent would the Council be in how it commissioned it services.
- Current NCC fees do not make it a fair system, with small independent providers being squeezed out of the market as the revenue margins were not there for them to function.
- Strong opinions about the brokerage service being kept within NCC/NASS/OCS. They felt that by keeping it “in house” it there would be conflict of interest. Many felt that brokerage should be an external independent service.
- Current commissioned contracts and how these would be affected especially during the transition period, with some coming to the end of the operational period.
- The role of safeguarding and the provision of deprivation of liberty services (DOLs) and where it would sit in the NASS/ NCC operating structures.

Public / Customer Consultation Events

A total of 132 people attended the three events. The below graphic helps to illustrate the key words used by attendees at the events.

Summary of questions, statements and comments received from public events are as below:

- Questions asked about NASS’s ownership and relevant governing and accountable decision structures. This includes how OCS would be maintained as an independent company in its own right, NASS’s relationship with NCC as a public body; and the
commercial ability of OCS to continue to make profit; and, where the profit and or dividends would be redirected too.

- Attendees asked about the cost savings NCC would achieve in setting up NASS. They asked about the cost of the various tiers of management and whether these would increase with the development of NASS.
- OCS’s brand identity was consistently mentioned. Many felt that OCS is a recognised brand, that some service provided by OCS were very good and that maintaining the OCS brand identity was important with NASS development.
- Customers, predominantly from OCS, were seeking assurance that no changes would occur to their current service. They were seeking clarity on their service not being diluted or their support being reduced. They enquired about potential changes in the price costs of service.
- Questions and statements on services which are intrinsically linked and associated with the care and support. In particular, customers asked about transport provision and whether there were any plans to remove this service; commented on the limitation of public transport with the county, especially in rural areas. Some expressed concerns about vulnerable adults being left to make long public transport journeys to attend various community based services. Another commented on appropriate and reasonable rate for personal assistant/ and or carers.
- Strong representation was made that the Council enter into accessible and appropriate dialogue with customers, family relatives and carers. NASS needed to make sure that it communicated, engaged, consulted and involved necessary stakeholders and customers with all developments. For example, they made reference to not being fully informed of the consultation processes held about their services.
- Respite care and access was commented upon both in terms of capacity and access to it. The coming together and sharing of information which NASS could do could provide further opportunities respite services in the county.
- Questions asked about how customers would contact NASS. They wanted clear and regularly updated contact information. Customers wanted communications to be timely, appropriate and relevant. Customers wanted to make sure that when they contacted the service they were not passed around the organisation. They said that this behaviour added to their frustration and resulted in a delay to issue being sorted out.
- Customers regularly commented that they wanted little change and disruption to their services. They said that change is unsettling and they needed stability especially for those customers with a learning disability. They asked specific questions on current vacant staff positions, and whether these would be filled.
- Current customers needed to be assured about relationships that NCC/ NASS may have with other providers of services. Comments were received on the provider sector making services unavailable due to their own resource constraints.
Comments and questions were asked about why NCC had built a new headquarters for NCC against a backdrop of financial pressures.

Observations and comments were made about current local government finance. This included the provision of the adult social care council tax precept and the diminishing national government funding. Customers asked whether their concerns on funding of adult social care could be raised nationally.

Questions and comments about the assessment process were mentioned. This included whether the process was the same for all customers and whether “cuts” in services would be applied across the services or would be applicable to specific customers groups. Also they stated that lack of regular reviews of care leading to crisis management.

Comments and discussion was held on CILs – Centre of Independent Living – and the service associated with this.

At one of the public events, attendees spoke of the work of the voluntary sector. Explaining that although well meaning, voluntary sector does rely on volunteers and therefore NCC could not solely rely on the sector. They said that the voluntary sector service offer is dependent on where it is based within the county. Often, rural areas of the county were not covered. In contrast, at another meeting, attendees expressed that the community sector has a lot to offer to social care.

Attendees were keen to point out that the Council needed to plan appropriately for its future services. They wanted to know how far in advance the council plans for and how would the plans and projects within them be resourced. This lead to discussion about workforce retention and development and the number of partners and providers the council worked with.

Attendees were informed of the development in assisted technologies and providing choice for all customers. However, attendees commented on the importance of “human touch and interaction”.

Comments on services that NCC have closed were given. They felt that “good” and much needed locally based services were closing and could not be recreated on a like for like basis at other venues. Attendees commented that after closure, the buildings remained boarded up and were subject to vandalism, and still being a resource drain on the Council.

OCS Staff who attended public events spoke of the changes they had experienced being part of OCS. They felt more empowered to make changes and focus on customer outcomes. They spoke of the challenges within social care; the need for the customer to have a voice and experience real opportunities to achieve what the customer wanted. Staff spoke of the having to protecting OCS “flagship” services by making changes and tweaks to other provision.

Customer Representative Group from OCS submitted comments which sought assurance on whether they would get the same service; whether they would remain with friends and staff; whether they would have access to transport to come to
services or to go out in the community. In essence customers just wanted to know what would change and how that change would affect them.

4c Written Responses

In addition to respondents completing the questionnaire four written submissions were received. Most were questions and statements that had been raised as a result of the respondent attending or not being able to attend the consultation events.

In summary these included:

- Accountability layers of NASS and how much this would cost the local tax payer.
- Leaving current OCS services provided such as the Resources Centre’s alone.
- Brokerage and Referral options needing to be outside and independent from Olympus and NASS.
- Being clear on current commissioned contracts and programmes of work.

Some comments were very specific on technical and practical operational aspects such as:

- Asking what administration software was going to be used.
- And how would this [software] impact on providers having to invest and use similar software.

Healthwatch Northamptonshire (HWN) provided a written response which acknowledged the difficult and challenging situation facing NCC in providing social care. However they comment on:

- Implementing wider ongoing engagement and involvement of key stakeholders which is inclusive so that users, carers and other key stakeholders, feel both informed and empowered by having opportunities to make their views heard and influence decision makers in the development of NASS. They felt that current engagement arrangements were not adequate for some customer groups and that these needed to be improved.
- Recognising the Council’s appetite for working in new and innovative ways with an increasingly diverse range of service providers, including the local voluntary and community sector organisations (VCS). They however sought assurance from the Council that a level “playing field” would be in operation for (VCS) to understand new priorities and develop appropriate changes to their services in line with the new agenda.
- The cost of implementation of the re-organisation, at a time when demand is high and budgets are challenged. They asked that these costs be reviewed and mitigated through appropriate actions.
4d Group Discussions

A self-serve slide pack was produced to encourage stakeholders to have their own discussions and then submit feedback. However, even though requests were made and packs sent, no direct feedback received could be directly attributed to this method. Although, it could be that feedback was made by respondents either by coming to consultation events or going online to complete the questionnaire.

5. Conclusion

This consultation was to seek the views from all interested parties to help inform and influence the design and development of the new delivery organisation for adult social care, called Northamptonshire Adult Social Care Services (NASS).

In total there were 238 participants to this consultation. 102 via the questionnaire, 132 event attendees, and 4 written submissions. The vast majority of respondents were from customers, their carers, and interested members of the public.

On the whole feedback from the online questionnaire was similar to that from the consultation events.

Customer respondents mentioned how highly they valued their existing service and expressed their desire that they remain unaffected by the proposals. This including maintaining and enhancing OCS’s community anchors services like the resource centres as well as OCS branding.

Consistently, requests were made for more detailed and understandable information about how the NASS proposals and development may affect the services delivered, as some felt the information provided to-date was too conceptual. Some respondents wanted more specific detail around the commercial aspect of NASS and OCS; they wanted to be assured of the accountability and governance of NASS, the role of wider public role of the Council. Some could not understand why OCS needed to be bought into the Council. Some did not view that OCS was already owned by the Council.

Concerns were raised over the fear of a conflict of interest between NCC and OCS and the subsequent lack of choice and person centred planning for customers.

The role and capacity of the local voluntary and community sector to work with NASS and/or provide care services and support was also questioned. Some respondents wanted the sector to be given time to develop and become a partner of choice for NASS with others saying that that sector did not and could not, due to its limited resources (both financial and people), delivery equitable and appropriate social care across the county.
Some respondents took this opportunity to express their disagreement with the proposals. Their reasons were varied. Their stated concerns included: fear that customers and carers will suffer; a lack of community and voluntary sector support; NASS will not be transparent and accountable to public taxpayer; and that NASS will add another layer of management and bureaucracy, which would be at the expense of the public purse.

Provider respondents in particular raised concerns on the governance and accountability of NASS and OCS, including asking what framework agreements existed, how transparent would its operations be; who would share from a profit made; and would making a profit be a primary function of NASS. The role of safeguarding and the provision of deprivation of liberty services (DOLs) was highlighted. In particular where this would sit within the NASS/NCC operating structures.

Above all, providers also wanted to know what the proposals would mean for current providers other than OCS, with worries that NCC through NASS will treat OCS as the preferred provider at the detriment to other service providers. Providers also wanted to know how the currently commissioned contracts would be affected especially during the transition period, with some coming to the end of the operational period.

Provider participants voiced strong opinions about the brokerage service being kept within NCC/NASS/OCS, many felt that by keeping it “in house” would be a conflict of interest. They felt that brokerage should be an external independent service.

Those questionnaire respondents who specifically referred to NASS’s outline business case, which was published online, scored it an average of 3.2 out of 5 for its clarity of language. Although most scores were positive many respondents took the opportunity to raise concern or criticism about the contents, including the lack of clarity about how future service delivery will affect and/or benefit NCC and its customers; not understanding what difference the proposals would actually make to the service; the lack of plain English in understanding the proposal. Respondents also criticised the proposed budget cuts to adult social services as outline in NCC’s budget consultation and raised their fear over the potential loss of services.

During the consultation requests were made to develop and enhance customer involvement and engagement. Customers wanted to secure more commitment from the Council and NASS that they would be kept informed of changes; and be involved in developments. From the online questionnaire, 24 individuals have come forward to join a NASS customer reference group.

In summary, the consultation focused on asking people to contribute to the future development of NASS, rather than the fact of creating NASS. Providers were most concerned about the perceived lack of independence of NCC, NASS and OCS, some of which was
addressed within the question and answers sessions at the consultation events. Customers’ and other stakeholders’ main worries were around services and the potential to lose them. They wanted to be communicated with – they wanted to be informed, engaged and consulted about changes to services. Current customers wanted NASS to be supportive of them and to help protect their services.

6. Equalities Statistics Summary

Equalities monitoring questions were asked of each questionnaire respondent. Although most individuals answered these questions not all respondents chose to complete this section of the questionnaire.

From the available completed responses, most of the questionnaire responses were female (66.7%). Most of the respondents were aged between 50 to 64 years (36.8%).

24.0% of respondents identified themselves as disabled, with physical disability being highlighted as the most frequent disability. The most common religion identified was Christian at 56.0% with 32.0% of participants choosing ‘None’. Predominantly respondents identified themselves as White British (84.4%). The majority of respondents were heterosexual (78.7%).

Responses were received from residents living across the county, with unsurprisingly the highest number of respondents living in Northampton (26.9%).

Full statistics of the responses can be found in Appendix 1.
A) Appendix 1: Questionnaire Results

1) We are interested to know about how well you understand what the council is trying to achieve in setting up Northamptonshire Adult Social Services. Can you help us by rating your understanding by using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'Very Unclear Understanding' and 5 is a 'Very Clear Understanding'.

There were 93 responses to this question. 11.8% answered 1, 17.2% answered 2, 28.0% answered 3, 26.9% answered 4, 15.1% answered 5, and 1.1% answered Don't know.

1a) Please tell us why you gave it this rating?

- I am very clear but I don’t see why the Council needs to create another company in order to do exactly what it was doing before OCS was set up and the NGC idea was brought up.
- Basically there is no answers to what cuts there is going to be for disabled and the elderly. As carers we totally rely on Riverside day centre and Eleanor lodge for respite so we can carry on our caring rolls.
- Not clear how or if current service delivery will be affected.
- Because I understand very well.
- Think there is a lack of transparency re the outcomes which appear to mean people will have far less choice as the council effectively directs services to themselves via Olympus Care. Seems to fly in the face of the Care Act provisions re ensuring a diverse and thriving marketplace and personalised outcomes for people.
- Because as far as the information you have given to the public is accurate, I understand it. Whether all information is there and clear, is unknown.
- It is clear in some places, but woolly on how they will raise money etc.
- As parents of a user who attends Patrick a Road Resource Centre, we were unaware that there was a consultation meeting.
- Communications on this matter have been disjointed and confusing.
- I understand that NCC is looking to shift responsibility by retaining the name of Olympus Care.
This is what I consider the right answer to your question.
I understand that the objective is to reduce time and costs whilst improving the service provided.
No evidence of what the benefits would be being an arms length body vs being a council department.
Attended the provider meeting on 27/01/2017 which made the proposals clear.
I cannot find the information as it is not widely promoted to residents.
Understand what they need to do, but not sure how it will benefit customers or NCC.
Not sure what the cuts will be.
Because you are going to cut everything.
We knew nothing of this until last week. Meetings need to be had with clients and parents / carers.
The information is clear in what is being planned but the language used is typical of 'council speak', overly wordy and on message losing some of its clarity by failing to communicate in plain English.
I understand the proposal but not what it is trying to achieve.
I understand the basic changes.
I am so very confused with the lack of information about all this change.
I only understand as I receive emails and am involved in groups. How do the user and carers get the information or are made aware?
I understand that OCS is the Trading arm but is there a separate management level for NASS. Hopefully to avoid duplication one management level will be enough for both companies.
Currently work for a local authority, so understand the need to review how services could be delivered differently, more cost effectively, without affecting customers eligible outcomes.
Not enough information of what this will mean in practice to existing providers who have only recently gone through a whole tender process.
Explanation given in publicity.
I have read your document outlining your proposals.
Unsure what the difference is between NCC running it directly where staff are employed by NCC and retains its statutory duties compared to setting up a Trust but still retaining statutory duties.
It is difficult at this stage, to fully understand how the council will achieve this with the vast budget constraints it faces.
The explanation offered is not in plain English and as a result, makes no sense to anyone outside of those who conceived the idea. Seriously, what the hell is a 'financial envelope' meant to mean?
I understand why NCC are proposing to set up NASS (done deal in everyone's opinion). What isn't understood is how NCC or OCS can make the 8 to 9 million in savings with out stopping services to people.
The council is attempting to deliver more cost effective services.
Read all proposals.
The use of unfamiliar terminology.
Intentionally unclear.
I have guessed the intentions will be the provision of additional care services, being arranged for both Home & in a Care Facility, in new premises and which will serve the ever growing community. For the less independent at such time when these people
can no longer take care of themselves permanently, the option then becomes available for residential & nursing & dementia care plus combinations of these, to be within new purpose-built premises. That new system would be owned by the Council, run by a new company & supported by the existing Olympus Care Services, with their input being utilized on the wider community, within individuals own homes.

- Don't understand the concept or the need.
- I have only just heard of this programme. Having worked for Northants. Social Services in the 1970's, I always thought that provision of services from child to adult was very good.
- I don't understand the concept.
- No idea.
- I am not aware of the details of what you intend to try to do.
- Having read the draft budget, I can see NCC wants/needs to save money. Using OCS as a trading arm could contribute to hose savings. NASS would then have a product to sell as well as provide locally.
- Reducing accountability and control.
- Social care is very broad subject, I have special interest in help for Parkinson’s and their carers.
- Have seen the work done at Delapre Abbey gardens.
- My experience and knowledge base linked to your description of the proposals.
- Straightforward explanation for this sort of thing.
- I understand the outline plans, but am not currently aware if any detailed plans.
- Read some information.
- Self explanatory proposals.
- I know very little about the project at this moment.
- Not to hard to follow at all.
- Introductory explanation is very clear.
- I believe this is all about saving money rather than re-organising properly.
- I understand that you want to get best value for money by effective adult social care but I have not seen what the aims are and how this will be measured nor how it will be achieved. But hopefully this will come later.
- Because you have not provided a proper consultation document. How am I supposed to make informed comments from a report to cabinet and its appendix? I suspect that you have already made your decisions and this is just another tick-box exercise.
- In December I felt that NCC was devoid of initiative when presenting the draft budget for 17-18. It appeared that social demands would be addressed in traditional ways. The proposals in the consultation package appear to offer a new way. If management and the workforce is selected on demonstrable past performance we, the funding public, might see more value for the outlay to be made if the budget is accepted.
- The wording used is complicated to understand. What does it all mean in laymen's terms.

2) Do you have any more comments that you would like to make?

- No (7)

- I am concerned about people's right to choose the care provider they wish. I believe the Council will feel compelled to give NASS priority on all commissions, even the direct purchase of services by individual clients. OCS services aren't always what
people want nor are they always of the right quality, people should be effectively forced to use these services because the services in the Market are being effectively staved of funds.

- Your idea of in the community will never work for every one they cannot manage on their own.
- It is essential that you continue to provide to relieve the pressure on carers and their families. Will frontline services be protected because without this careers will not be able to continue.
- My comments include: How will smaller teams be able to support vulnerable individuals; How will reviews be undertaken in a timely, and proper way? How will you prioritise workloads; As Olympus are part of NASS, is this not a conflict of interest? So this means that people have less choice around where they now live in a care home - as Olympus will be first choice, in order to be successful for NCC. There is little mention of brokerage in your on line consultation, but this is already in place and already making decisions which are not person centred for individuals - but on funding and allocation of available resource. Please explain how that works given personalisation, care act and wellbeing. This is not a consultation as already changes have taken place with Older People and Reviewing Teams and Brokerage prior to this consultation ending. There also may be other changes which the general public are unaware of.
- It seems to be offering nothing different to what is on now. Just a new name, and the ability to raise funds.
- About more house of care & Support and more PA Staff for Disability & Disabled People and more choice of Job & Pay Work & Jobs in Day Centre & Services for Disability & Disabled People and more choice of Friends & Relationship for us in Northamptonshire and about who Next Steps are not doting their Jobs for Disability & Disabled People in Kettering & Northamptonshire and it is not on & Disability & Disabled People and their Carers & Support Staff are not happy about who Next Steps in Kettering & Northamptonshire are not their Jobs who Next Steps so be doting their Jobs and it is not on now?
- Olympus Care and its staff do a marvellous job at Patrick Road, why change things if they provide a service which is badly needed.
- When communicating with people with disabilities much more clear and precise delivery should be undertaken. Remember these individual struggle with big words (generally more than one syllable) and long sentences. Understanding and confusion is usually expelled by simply agreeing!!!
- I don’t think you need to use an alias (another layer to penetrate). Customers need to know and feel safe in the knowledge that it is their council that is controlling their care.
- That if the council hadn’t spent the best part of £50 million on duplicating existing services in creating 'First for Wellbeing' but tendered it out to non council organisations already preforming the services then the charities/ non profit organisations/ organisations would still be in existence/ providing and we wouldn’t be on the brink of a social care crisis!!
- Their appears to be a high potential for a conflict of interest arising from the combination of the council's social care services together with their purchasing (brokerage) teams into a single limited company whose role is to generate income for the council.
It is just not the client but the whole family that will suffer. So much for looking after disabled/ vulnerable people.

The changes you are proposing affect our family members or ourselves. The lack of information as to what is happening is so frightening and stressful.

Without seeing a proposed structure for NASS moving forward, it is difficult to fully understand the potential changes to service delivery.

Please write the consultation information in actual real terms rather than making up concepts which are essentially meaningless.

Stupid idea.

I’m not entirely sure that my understanding of the proposal is correct, so would be interested to know? Plus an outline of the new facility plans would assist in deciding whether the proposal is reasonable or not and whether additional questions would then arise.

Leave Olympus alone.

I am concerned that that NASS will become very non-competitive locally and will reduce choice for the consumer.

Olympus care is too fragmented and services not interconnected.

Yes.

I am deeply concerned that the Council plans to set up a commercial organisation, which, while it will no doubt be subject to commercial governance rules, will not be accountable to the public taxpayer.

Yes. I think this will just add another layer of management to an already over-bureaucratic organisation. Existing staff will transfer to the new organisation and the same old attitudes will remain.

From my previous dealings with the Council as a service user and a carer you have repeatedly demonstrated that you are unable to deliver your statutory duties within the current model, let alone set up something radically new and have a hope in it succeeding. I’ve experienced a lack of competence and/or willingness to do a job properly right the way from frontline social workers all the way up to the Director of Adult Social Services. Plus I’ve been part of numerous reference and focus groups over the years and it never matters what we say - we ticked your boxes, our expertise was never genuinely valued, and nothing ever changed. One specific recommendation I would make is that [name] is persuaded to retire and not TUPE’d across to the new organisation. He is neither use nor ornament.

3) If you would like to be more involved in shaping Northamptonshire Adult Social Services then please tell us your name and contact details. We will be in touch with you with further information about how you can assist us. Your answers to this questionnaire will remain anonymous. These contact details will not be used in any way other than to contact you and the answers you have given to this consultation will remain anonymous. I would like to join the Northamptonshire Adult Social Service customer reference group.
There were 74 responses to this question. 32.4% answered Yes, and 67.6% answered No.

4) In what respect are you answering this questionnaire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a current customer of NCC Adult Social Care and/ or Olympus Care Services</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a relative/ carer of someone using NCC Adult Social Care and/ or Olympus Care Services</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a friend of someone using NCC Adult Social Care and/ or Olympus Care Services</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of the public</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of staff employed by Olympus Care Services</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of staff employed by Northamptonshire County Council</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a Councillor</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a provider of adult social care services</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a professional e.g. GP, district nurse, etc</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other:
- I am an advocate working in the community.
- I work for [provider organisation] Bedfordshire but live in Northamptonshire.
- I'm a past user of NCC adult Social Care.
- A former ‘customer’ of NCC Adult Social Care (I hate being called a customer).
- I am a full time carer for my partner who has Parkinsons.
- I help out at Project Care for a few hours a week.
- I am a trustee of two charities with a specific interest in the provision of services to the vulnerable elderly, one provides a care home and the other alms house provision.
- I am aware that several members of my own family may soon be in the unfortunate position of requiring these services.
- I am a volunteer Benefit adviser visiting elderly and disabled clients at home.
5) Are you responding as an individual or an organisation?

There were 91 responses to this question. 91.2% answered Individual, and 8.8% answered Organisation.

5a) If you are replying on behalf of an organisation, please tell us the name of the organisation and your role?

- [Provider organisation] Manager
- [Provider organisation] Head of Contracts
- [Provider organisation Northamptonshire] Manager
Demographic Questions

1) In which district/borough do you live in?

There were 78 responses to this question. 6.4% answered Corby, 14.1% answered Daventry, 19.2% answered East Northamptonshire, 14.1% answered Kettering, 26.9% answered Northampton, 10.3% answered South Northamptonshire, 6.4% answered Wellingborough, and 2.6% answered Other.

Other responses:
- Rushden
- Thrapston

2) What gender are you?

There were 75 responses to this question. 30.7% answered Male, 66.7% answered Female, and 2.7% answered Prefer not to say.
3) Are you currently Pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months?

There were 72 responses to this question. 2.8% answered Yes, 93.1% answered No, and 4.2% answered Prefer not to say.

4) How old are you?

There were 76 responses to this question. 0.0% answered 0 to 9, 0.0% answered 10 to 19, 5.3% answered 20 to 29, 26.3% answered 30 to 49, 36.8% answered 50 to 64, 18.4% answered 65 to 74, 9.2% answered 75+, and 4.0% answered Prefer not to say.

5) Do you have a disability?

There were 75 responses to this question. 24.0% answered Yes, 66.7% answered No, and 9.3% answered Prefer not to say.
5a) If Yes, please tick the appropriate box(es) which best describes your disability?

There were 19 responses to this question. 5 answered Mental Health, 9 answered Physical Disability, 2 answered Hearing Impairment, 0 answered Sight Impairment, 3 answered Learning Disability, and 0 answered Other.

6) What is your religion or belief?

There were 75 responses to this question. 32.0% answered None, 56.0% answered Christian, 0.0% answered Hindu, 0.0% answered Jewish, 1.3% answered Muslim, 0.0% answered Sikh, 0.0% answered Buddhist, 9.3% answered Prefer not to say, and 1.3% answered Other.

Other:
- Atheist
7) How would you describe your ethnic origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White - English</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Scottish</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Irish</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Welsh</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - other</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy or Traveller</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British - Indian</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian background</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British - Caribbean</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British - African</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black background</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Multiple ethnic background - White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Multiple ethnic background - White and Black African</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Multiple ethnic background - White and Asian</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed/Multiple background</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic group (please specify)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 77
skipped question: 25

Other:
- Dual, also White Irish and White British

8) If you are 16 or over which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself?

There were 75 responses to this question. 0.0% answered Bisexual, 0.0% answered Gay Man, 4.0% answered Gay Woman / Lesbian, 78.7% answered Heterosexual, and 17.3% answered Prefer not to say.

Answered Options: 77
Skipped Options: 25

Bar chart showing:
- Bisexual: 0.0%
- Gay Man: 0.0%
- Gay Woman / Lesbian: 4.0%
- Heterosexual: 78.7%
- Prefer not to say: 17.3%
9) Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?

There were 76 responses to this question. 89.5% answered Yes, 1.3% answered No, and 9.2% answered Prefer not to say.

10) What would you describe your marital status as?

There were 76 responses to this question. 63.2% answered Married, 22.4% answered Single, 4.0% answered Civil Partnership, 1.3% answered Widow/Widower, 2.6% answered Other, and 6.8% answered Prefer not to say.
## B) Appendix 2 – Consultation Events Feedback

**Redacted Data from questions and answers sessions**

**PUBLIC EVENTS** – north (Patrick Road Resource Centre, Corby - 46 attendees), south (Riverside Resource Centre, Towcester – 26 attendees) and centre of the county (Gladstone Road Resource Centre, Northampton - 60 attendees).

| Q. Who will own OCS and will it still be independent? | NCC will solely own NASS and OCS. NCC has always owned OCS. |
| Q. Will OCS be going back to and being part of NCC? | No, NASS is coming over to OCS. OCS will still need to trade as it is now to help with the funding gap with NCC, as OCS’s profits will still be shared with NCC. OCS still needs to drive commercial aspect. |
| Q. Will OCS be changing its name to NASS? | OCS is a recognised and established brand and will be keeping its brand. |
| Q. Will prices for services change? | Prices change all the time as part of NCC’s duty is to try and keep prices as low as possible for customers. |
| Q. Will customers still get the same types of care and support? | Restructuring under NASS will not change the care and support being delivered by OCS. |
| Q. Will the establishment of NASS enable more referrals? | There will be no difference. |
| Q. What are the changes going to be to OCS services? | This is a change to the structure, not changing the services. OCS will still be providing the same service. |
| Q. Don’t care about the name so long as our services will remain the same. | |
| Q. Can you seek extra funding from Lottery grants etc? | NASS will be owned by NCC so it is not entitled to access these funds. |
| Q. Will there be changes in the transport provision? | Public transport is often infrequent in villages and rural locations. |
There are currently no discussions to remove transport and it is not part of this consultation. However, we do not know yet what will happen after NCC’s budget review has been conducted. Corby has a better transport infrastructure compared to other areas of the county. Public transport has always been limited in rural areas.

**Q. How can people have their say on the consultation who are not computer literate?**

People are having their say by attending the public consultation events. They can also speak to a member of staff to help them or to ask them to pass on their feedback. Feedback can also be given over the phone or in writing, or you can ask a friend to help you have your say.

**Q. Will respite care be affected? I care for two adults with physical disabilities and am nearly 80 years old. I have had difficulty booking the caravan.**

The Caravan is being widely publicised by the marketing team, but first call is always for our customers.

Moving to NASS will not affect the provision of respite care.

**Q. Why do you keep changing things? Isn’t there a cost to keep changing the brand name? Changing brands etc still costs money. You can use this money for the service. OCS is fine. You should think of these things in your long term planning.**

Yes there is, however in the long term it is more financially efficient to change the name. It is advantageous to bring things together for the long term. This change helps us do that. Moving offices does in the long term save money.

**Q. Is there going to be a central office? I do not like the fact that I go around “the house” when I am calling for something.**

The aim is to bring things together. To make the service “smoother”. The consolidation of NCC office space and also for NCC and OCS staff will make it easier for all to work together. But there will be necessity to maintain contact in the community; but the transitions will be easier for example when passing over calls between teams.

The aim is to keep all informed. Any changes to emails address etc will happen in the background – our aim is to keep everything the same and cause minimal disruption to customers.

**Q. Will there be one place of contact for service on matters like accounts and payment?**

It will remain the same. So, if it to do with adult social care and what NCC contribute then that will be the NCC; if it something that you purchase from OCS it will through LGSS. So it will remain the same for now.

**Q. When does it officially start?**
1st April 2017. Staff will be TUPE in September 2017

**Q. What about Shaw Healthcare – will they stay the same?**

Shaw Healthcare is a separate organisation. It is an independent provider. NCC have a contract with them. They are not part of NCC or OCS.

**Q. Procurement process are fine, but the outcome of them can be horrendous with the changes that it can bring to customers. Often customers with LD need little disruption and change. You should make things easier.**

Bringing the organisations into one place will help it become more effective and smooth. But essentially, yes, it is about people and not organisations.

Organisations do have to work together and we are talking to health all the time about this – so really social care is about people and making things effective for customers and their family/relatives not about the organisations who run and provide social care.

**Q. Why are you building a new office?**

County Hall is a very old building and the maintenance costs are very high. It was never designed or meant to be used as offices. Some of the building is the old court houses and there are the judges lodging.

About 5 years ago, the Council decided to build a new office block.

NCC is going to vacate and or sell 12 buildings. This means that many of the teams will be able to work in the same place. Making it more effective and efficient.

The new modern building – in Angel Street in Northampton – is costing £40m however estimated saving for the Council in 10 years is £54m. 2000 more staff will be working in the Northampton town centre bringing additional economic benefit to the town.

Some of the current County Hall buildings have been bought by the Borough Council.

**Q. What is the purpose of having Olympus Care as an organisation?**

Councils, as a public body, cannot operate to make a profit.

Olympus acts as a legitimate arm’s length company to the council therefore can make a profit. Any dividends i.e. some profit can be returned to the county council.

Since 2010, the reduction and the disappearance of the government’s Revenue Support Grant has mean councils essentially need a way for them to find funds themselves. Councils are able to use reserves if they have, and the Government has allows for council tax precepts to be levied for adult social care. NCC do not have high levels of reserve and does not wish to levy more that the permitted council tax precepts. In setting up OCS and now bringing it back to NCC and then back to NASS the council can continue to innovate and essentially provide and protect services for vulnerable adults.
Q. Respite care in non-existent. It is really difficult to find. Due to the council fee rates some care places are not making them available as it is not cost effective for the care provider.

The Council is currently working to provide an on-line solution for finding current care place vacancies. This one port of call for all information on this matter will be available to all including the new brokerage service. This will help improve access to the information available on all care vacancies including respite care.

Q. The voluntary sector and volunteering services may be a solution but they are not always reliable. They rely on volunteers and so if a volunteer does not show and a service is closed or cancelled it becomes very hard to explain to someone especially with a learning disability that they cannot go to something. This can cause a lot of upset. Also in this end of the county it is difficult to find everything. It can mean travelling a very long distance, sometimes on scarce public transport. This is not always very safe for people with a learning disability.

Q. How far ahead are you planning?

10 year plan but within this are 3 year and 5 year plans too. The plans help project demographic changes both locally and nationally.

Q. Where would the money come from to fund projects like the dementia village?

The Councils works with many partners and including the district and borough councils. We work with them on joint plans and strategies. We work with many partners and developers to make sure that 106 planning monies are used for public benefit.

Q. Odd houses are being allocated and built within new housing development. Is this just not isolating people? What more can be done? Sometimes people need for long term support and there are not enough carers to do this.

There are great developments in assisted technology which are there to assist and help people maintain some independent quality of life within their own homes and community.

Providing different types of housings is important. Supported living/ housing the right solution to some people. It is a choice which some people chose to accept and others do not. Some like the independence and as well being part of a wider community which has some levels of safeguarding and checks built in.

Q. Is anything actually being done with the Daventry - Grange -building? It has been empty for many years. Although Evelyn Wright House has been sorted out recently, Grange is still a problem. Quarry House was closed despite it being fit for purpose.

The Grange is subject to a government bid in order to develop it further. Unfortunately these things take time. It is a long process to get things approved.
When services are decommissioned the council works with the customer and family to ensure that suitable alternatives are found.

### Q. The council is not explain things enough, communication is not good enough. You need to explain things properly especially to customers. You need to work with people on the ground i.e. staff, families and carers.

Communications and sharing information are things that we looking to definitely improve. Having NASS will help us do that.

### Q. Do you have social media sites?

NCC and OCS has various social media sites e.g. Twitter and Facebook.

### Q. Is Olympus going to give up their brand that has such a good reputation?

No, we’re definitely keeping the Olympus Care Services name. It will continue to work the same way.

### OCS have been providing a service which often is working with the whole family who are in crisis. Working with all they become creative and make sure that outcomes are understood and focused on. OCS is in a difficult time at the moment with all the issues that face adult social care. For those younger customers it is important to provide “real” opportunities for them. It is making sure that they have a voice; being involved in staff recruitment; learning to find independence and for some employment opportunities. Minor tweaks and changes to the service need to happen to protect services. These may be seen as cost cutting, but they are not. Looking at reshaping services, giving opportunities and ensuring most importantly that customers and well and healthy, in the long run maintains and protects services.

### Q. When is the next update?

A full business case is being presented to Cabinet in March. The outcome of the consultation on NASS will be considered.

Moving forward, there will be a need to better communicate to all. Important in this is the need to engage and involve customers and family carers. We need to keep things simple and involve in a timely manner. We make an undertaking to consider this and improve on it.

### Q. The following written questions were submitted by LIVE Wellingborough Team customers via Customer Representative who attended the meeting but had to leave
earlier.

- Will I still get my day service?
- Will I be with the same people – my friends, the staff?
- Will we still have transport?
  - To get to the day service
  - To go out into the community
- Why is it changing, do I need to worry?
- Is anything going to change for me?

Q. If the Council are trying to save money, why are we changing and how much is it going to cost?

When coalition formed, Revenue Support Grant of £1bn to disappear by 2020. This impacts NCC and all Councils. – 70% of budget from Government – NCC have to make up shortfall – but Council tax rise is limited.

Decided to completely re-model services and ‘Next Generation’ model formed. Part of the Next Generation model is for ASC and OCS to merge to NASS, to become one organisation to enable money to be raised via charging for services and working with external partners and make the savings that need to be made.

NCC moved from £1bn to £750 trillion. Because of input from Government in 2010 there is a reduction in financial support. Trying to work closer with Health.

May have seen recently in the news about Surrey Council raising council tax and that council under pressure. All councils are facing the same challenges.

Q. How much will they have to pay their Personal Assistants – must pay a reasonable rate for carers, if want to keep them.

We have to look at all areas as have limited money and have to provide the care required. There is a challenge on rate of pay from direct than agency.

Q. Will the assessment for service users be different or will there be cuts that are significant for one person and not the other?

Less money for more people. Day services are crucial to service users and carers. If we didn’t have these services then it would cost more.

Q. People need continuity and dignity. Currently live on a knife-edge, more people going into crisis as people are having to stay in their homes with no regular reviews. People are distraught by the system. Who responsible?

NASS will ensure the system is run more effectively. Anna Earnshaw will be responsible as MD [Managing Director] of NASS.
Q. As a parent carer I was not invited to this meeting and happened to stumble across it online. Why where we not informed?

Apologised. This feedback has been taken on board and better communications will be looked at in future.

Q. How will the financial side be carried out?

CILS will be part of NASS.

Q. Respite care is vital, son loves going into respite.

Joining up of ASC and OCS will provide opportunities for better service pathways and avoid duplication.

Q. Person who is wheelchair bound cannot get an assessment for her partner.

A As above, by working together there will be better pathways.

Q. Can customers concerns be reported to the Government by NCC?

NCC have had a number of consultations/meetings with MP’s and Government to express concerns. It is not just NCC but all Councils have the same problems with ASC funding. Government need to fund ASC differently.

Q. Communities are also partners of NCC and could help provide the answers.

Communications issue has been logged not just here but other meetings. A lot of packages are community packages and will include stakeholders of the community.

Q. Charge rate here £65 a day – other providers charge the same and are doing ok.

There may be differences in services and volume of visitors. Anything [profit] that OCS has made has gone back into its services.

Q. With £8.5m to save, changing the branding and name of OCS to NASS and restarting from scratch seems to be a waste of money. NASS sounds nasty.

[Name] worked for 35 years and is proud and inspired about what we do. As Operations Director job is to protect about all the good things. OCS branding will be kept

Q. CILS get things sorted and are a key part to get advice.

If need to provide for support, will be here but different area.

Q. How many other Councils are doing this?

Other councils are responding in different ways. Next Generation is unique but all councils are having to make savings and reduce overall costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>How many tiers of management are there between the service manage and Chief Executive? Will there be more under NASS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There will be less tiers under NASS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Will vacant staff positions stay?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can't say it will stay the same but there are no plans to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Examples of how a change in brand will save money.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimise the amount of tax and VAT with the new company.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Why couldn’t OCS do this? [minimise tax and VAT]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCS is an arms-length company. The council had to bring in ASC so could save money and allow the re-organisation and allow teams to work together. OCS will still be operating but in a different format.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Change is unsettling – had to move twice for Kettering day services. Customers don’t understand and cannot cope with all these changes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People had to move from Henley [Kettering] as the building was dangerous and not safe to stay in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overriding drive is to keep services rather than close. Cllr Parker has heard this very clear message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>How often are carers checked?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All carers are police checked and then CQC also check. We have good carers but if anyone is concerned about their carer they need to speak to the organisation first or can report to CQC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>In NASS would there be an even field for those public funded and privately funded? Is there an expansion plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, self-funders support services and the development of services. Also looking at care villages to make things better for the people of Northamptonshire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>When met with Government did they take on NCC’s concerns? Are they are conscious of the problems that ASC/OCS face.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government know that this affects all Councils and need to recognise how to help councils provide services with pressures like an aging population and that just raising council tax will not help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All those on the Cabinet are aware of the concerns and pressures you have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Where are you getting money from to build the care villages?</td>
<td>By working with providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Re. budget on resources – where does this stand will there be cuts?</td>
<td>Next year’s budget is workable and will have minimal impact on the services provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Re. Care villages – feel it is a place where you are not seen and not heard and not living with the community.</td>
<td>There has been positive feedback from those in such type of care home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. How is NASS legally structured?</td>
<td>It is structured as limited by guarantee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Question arose re. branding</td>
<td>OCS will still keep its branding but will be part of NASS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. In reference to respite care in Corby and Northampton – are there any plans to close Pine Lodge?</td>
<td>There are no plans to close Pine Lodge but doesn’t mean there could be changes and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. If OCS is staying ‘over the door’ why are we having a consultation?</td>
<td>We are legally obliged to complete consultation. We are keeping OCS brand but changing the way we operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. What are the costs to re-brand?</td>
<td>It would be a nominal amount, although an exact figure is unknown. This figure can be obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Was the consultation advertised to the press?</td>
<td>Corporate communications would have told the press and it is up to the press whether they turn up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Question reference wasting millions of pounds reference to prevention agenda 3 years ago.</td>
<td>Cllr Parker unaware as was appointed councillor with lead responsibility for Adult Social Care in May. He had not come across this when he has remit of responsibility for finance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q. What will happen to staff at the Gladstone, Corby and Towcester centres and are these centres going to close?

Cannot guarantee any closures, but there are no plans in the budget to close centres. We have an aging population and we need to do things differently. Things cannot stay the same which is why the Next Generation model was created.

### Q. We heard rumours Patrick Road will close in 6 months. Is this true?

**Are centres under any threats from closure?**

**Can you give a guarantee Patrick Road will be here in 5 years time?**

All local authorities have funding problems and there is an ageing population putting pressures on Adult Social Care. NCC is lobbying the government for more funding. Central government are allowing councils to increase Council tax by a further 2% for Adult Social Care but there is still a shortfall of funding. Having NASS and OCS as separate organisations under NCC’s next generation model allows them to go out and raise funds to help fund the services. As NCC is a local authority it is not allowed by law to raise these funds itself.

There are no plans to close Patrick Road. We want to promote it more as the more people who attend the service the better it will be and will increase profitability.

### Q. Want Patrick Road to be better advertised by OCS so more people can benefit from the services being provided as many people don't know Patrick Road exists.

**Should be advertised more via social media, bigger signage on building, local paper, local radio, leaflets, and better promoted at GP surgeries and hospitals.**

Local Councillor initially didn't know what services/activities were being delivered at Patrick Road and it should be advertised more widely – now aware of the service and thinks it is outstanding.

OCS have recently recruited a Marketing Executive who will be forwarded customers feedback and suggestions.

OCS has been advertising and have also held open days, fetes, and been on local radio. Will develop a Corby/Patrick Road marketing strategy. Staff and customers can work together to develop this strategy.

### Q. Local tenant/residents hold monthly committee meetings. Recommend a member of staff from Patrick Road attends these to help promote the centre.

Good idea which we will look into.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. OCS customers have a Facebook page which should be better promoted as many customers don’t know it exists.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will be reported back to the marketing team, and efforts made to publicise the Facebook page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. What will be the impact on Patrick Road with current cutbacks being made within Adult Social Care? Patrick Road requires funding to ensure the centre is a venue where people want to attend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring NASS together with OCS won’t change any funding issues which are currently under consideration as part of NCC’s budget review. NCC’s budget consultation, which closed last week, is separate to this consultation. Funding for Adult Social Care is a challenge across the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. A day centre is often thought of in a negative context whereas it is excellent here at Patrick Road, and the staff are great as they care and listen to the customers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services at Patrick Road are excellent as includes specialist services such as onsite physiotherapy which has stopped customer from requiring surgery. Would like physiotherapist to be available every day at the centre instead of the current 2 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to keep doing hot meals at Patrick Road as they are important for people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good to hear people are pleased with the services being delivered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. What is the centre’s relationship with education providers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult learning service use to deliver sessions at the centre but these ended. The centre is currently looking to reinstate them and are currently in discussions with them to discuss the viability of this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Can customers’ pick and choose what aspects of the service they want from the centre?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From an operational perspective there is no reason why they cannot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Do local businesses support i.e. sponsor the centre?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not currently but staff here and customers are welcome to form their own committee or working group to help develop this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Many people think Patrick Road is just for learning disability customers and are not aware physical disability customers attend as well.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My relative has a learning disability and attends Oakley Grange which is onsite here. Is this service inclusive for all depending on nature and severity of disability? There are many people with physical disability here today and it feels as though people with...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
learning disability are being moved aside to make way for people with physical disability within the unit.

Q. This meeting is under represented by learning disability customers who attend at Oakley Grange, which is part of this unit.

There is a need to have the right mix of customers attend the centre and access the services. In the past physical disability customers were leaving the centre as they felt too much space was being prioritised to customers with a learning disability. Currently making changes to try and adjust balance and increase number of customers with a physical disability. Both parts of the unit interact with each other and joint sessions need to be done at the right level so customers are comfortable regardless of their disability. Staff are trained to deal with specific needs.

This consultation meeting has been promoted amongst Oakley Grange staff and customers.

Q. There is a need for more male carers at Patrick Road.

There are currently no vacancies but we acknowledge we need to recruit more male carers, although they are difficult to recruit. A recruitment drive is taking place at the moment.

Q. People here are worried that the services and staff going to be cut. Is the Riverside Resource Centre safe and are the staff safe?

NCC has certain statutory responsibilities and we will not stop and doing this. We are trying to protect these services otherwise if we stopped then we would end up in court. What we are doing with NASS is remodelling services. In doing so we want to make sure that the impact of any change is minimal for everyone.

We are also in constant contact with Government ministers about the adult social care services. We are doing all we can to protect local services.

Q. People with Learning Disabilities still need places to go. Care in the community is poor. Places like the Riverside Resources Centre are important as they are places where there is essential social interaction and they are safeguarded. For many coming to the resource centre is like going to work. Customers form bonds and friendships with each other and this includes families and carers supporting each other.

Q. Can you guarantee what we have at Riverside Resource Centre/ OCS will be maintained in current council budget?

Budget going to the cabinet next week and then goes to full council at the end of the month so after that. There are 4 proposals within there about adult social care. These are about service for learning disability; staffing and NCC existing plans; arrangements with health and financial debt and collection of it.

Q. Are the savings going to impact on services on places like Gladstone? Staff at
Gladstone give carers respite. Where will the savings fall? Customers and staff need to know. People are scared for the future, people don’t understand and people need to plan as personalised budgets are falling.

NCC have to provide statutory services but need to do this in a different way to enable current services to be sustainable in the future. More efficient and effective services and working with outside partners, the private sector and charities.

Q. If Council decide to close Gladstone and Corby people will be at home and there would be more crisis emergency care which costs the council.

Acknowledge that crisis emergency care has higher increased costs. Day services help ensure money is spent in the most effective way.

Q. Concerns on the future of Gladstone Road.
Plan to keep services at Gladstone

Q. Many services have closed and moved to different places/merged with different teams. How many times are people going to have to move?

Council money is not just for day services but for all Adult Social Care services. Centre for Independent Living will be moving from Gladstone which will allow space for other services.
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Q. How does deprivation of liberty (DOLs) work fit in NASS? Is this not safeguarding matter and be with the NCC Core?

Safeguarding has to sit with NCC core due to legislation, and will remain under the DASS, alongside quality and performance.

NASS’ work with DOLs is around the operational aspects of the mental health team. At the moment this is where we think that it fits but if as a result of consultation we hear differently then it will be considered.

Q. Will safeguarding be undertaken as an independent function? Will it be the same social worker investigating as it is now? Where is the independence in Safeguarding?

The first point is to establish whether the matter is safeguarding or whether it is a “practice” issue. Depending on what it is that affects the way in which it is dealt with. If it is deemed to be serious then it enters a safeguarding route. If it is a “practice” and low level then it may be dealt by the business i.e. social worker.
Q. What is the difference between the “commissioning team” and the “brokerage team”?

The commissioning function is a strategic commissioning and NCC core will be looking at the adult social care commissioning as well as public health and wellbeing. It will be looking at the future requirement of the needs of Northamptonshire people, not just adults. The Brokerage team is a function which will be an information point which assists to meet the overall outcomes of a person’s care plan.

Q. OCS is an independent service? Should brokerage not be independent to help avoid any preferential treatment towards NASS? Is OCS not a competitor?

OCS is part of the operational aspects of NASS. However, consultation comments on this will be considered in the overall business plan, as we need to work with the existing market.

Q. Seems like a conflict of interest for brokerage to be part of OCS. I have seen things in other parts of the country where it never really operates independently.

Concerns are noted.

Q. I have an email from this week from NCC brokerage officers to say that OCS is preferred over anything else.

NCC already have some block contacts/PFI arrangements for some services which will need to be utilised in the first instance. – there is £180m contracted out compared to block contracts of £20m.

Q. What is this consultation about?

The consultation is about the creation of the organisation. It is about getting feedback on the outline business plan which has been presented to Cabinet in November 2016. It is about picking out issues which are of concern to the stakeholders. It is about helping us creating an organisation which works for Northamptonshire.

The company – NASS – is registered. The current 2 services exist, with one (OCS) trading and one not. This new company is about bringing both together. The difference is that NASS will be seeking to trade further.

Q. Where is the framework agreement?

NASS will have a contract behind it. The contract is likely to be out in summer 2017.

There are already detailed contracts in place for services, these will not automatically be novated. Due process will be entered into for these contracts as per procurement rules.

Q. What about the current contracts that are due to end in March 2017?
Q. I have no idea what is happening with core contract ending in March this year?

This is about bringing current services together. It is not about taking on other contracts that are currently being delivered. A number of contracts will not be novated. Some will be continued. Not able to comment on individual cases at this meeting but can look into afterwards.

Q. In terms of future work, will NASS trade, tender and be given preferential work?

The expectation is that it will deliver some of the services and tender.

Q. Clarification is sought on the timescale for this? In correspondence, some say it is February 2017.

February was original date to return to the business case to Cabinet. However, it will go to NCC scrutiny first, which will take place on 1st March prior to taking the business case to the March Cabinet meeting.

Q. Next Generation Model – seems forward thinking, but how does this fit into current budget shortfall?

There has been a significant budget fall and adult social care continues to be a big spender due to demographic factors. This is why we need to look at the service in a different way. OCS was set up to be arm’s length so that it could trade. OCS will be coming back “in house” and NASS will be working with OCS to bring income into the council. Central government are allowing councils to increase Council tax by a further 2% but there is still a shortfall of funding.

Q. When fully operational, how much money will NASS bring into the Council?

Looking towards £144m within the 4 year budget. May be a slight dip to begin with but may pick up

Q. OCS’ MD is NASS’ MD? Independence?

OCS are the sister company to NASS and, with the exception of block contracts, will tender alongside other providers.

Q. Concern is that it is a trading company and is there to make a profit. NASS will be in a position to cherry pick the lucrative work. What are the checks and balances?

It is about being honest and yes it will trade but it will need to compete too. We will want to avoid cherry picking and the company will be accountable to NCC. OCS knows its areas of expertise and will focus on the areas it can specialise in.

Q. Looking ahead, 5 years down the line. If difficult to make service stack up and losing money the managing director will look at the long term issues, can the managing director change directions.
That is why we have governance in place i.e. NCC Cabinet would need to authorise, approve and agree any changes of direction as it will be run with public money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Will NASS/ the company always be an agenda item in council meetings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It will be an agenda item, yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Who shares the profit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASS is solely owned by the Council and the dividends will come back to the Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Is it about making excessive profit? Regulations through trading rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors will not benefit from a profit. The company will operate legitimately including applying tax rules and licenced with the Inland Revenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Conflict of interest for a public body? Revenue for the council.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No conflict of interest, the council needs to bring money into the organisation to compensate for lack of national government funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Fees – will NCC be paying same rates to company for services as it does for independent sectors? Will the independent service offer be an enhanced one?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees are part of council budget setting and our current draft budget was subject to consultation and being set soon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Independent sector have been known to deliver more cost effective homes than a local authority and some other local authorities chose to close their own homes to save money.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCS focussing on what they do well. NCC are looking at own overarching commissioning strategy which will be developed for the council and sector needs. Wider accommodation needs will not be met by the in house service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. There are different rates of pay for staff. NorArch have fed this back as not fair competition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This was acknowledged but session was to talk about the design of NASS and not fees which are part of the draft budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Why does the Council need to have an in house provider?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Care Act puts in measures that make a local authority responsible to provide support should there be market failure. Why would the council have a massive provision – why would we want to? However, there are some things that the council does that are held up to be outstanding which must be maintained, for example reablement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q. Other independent providers are having difficulties. NCC needs to acknowledge small providers when reviewing their fees. Need to keep up standards/ investment in the sector.

We have increased fees, including Domiciliary care budgets, by 6%. We do hear about the difficulties with fees and charges but not all difficulties are just financial and we all need to work together. Adult Social Care is in extreme difficulties across the country and is underfunded nationally.

### Session 2

#### Q. Concerned about the brokerage function? How will they have the knowledge to assess?

Assessments will continue to be carried out as before. Brokerage will only do the purchasing not the assessments. They will come with a support plan.

NASS brokerage is about consolidating knowledge of available services across the county. What needs to happen is a move for assessments to result in producing outcome focused care plans. Brokerage will look at all the information from which it is then possible to look at alternative options.

#### Q. Does this mean that Brokerage will use a Reverse Auction?

Intention for setting up the company – NASS – is to see how can we meet the needs of people of Northamptonshire in the best way. Contracts will be based on the best fit for a person’s needs and to work towards reablement.

#### Q. Will it be a private or public company?

Private company within NCC, a public body.

#### Q. Will there be a preference to place within own company?

We will always favour block contracts first – we are getting lots of referrals through – one organisation cannot cope with all of it. A person’s need will always come first.

#### Q. As a domiciliary care agency, we are always up to capacity at all times. Are there plans to bring in statutory wage levels which maintain the viability of the independent sector? We have difficulty recruiting workforce.

OCS has the same problems. It is a struggle. We all need to do this together. NCC is looking at this different model of work. It is looking at an outcome model which will be a 5 year contract to help sustainability. Advert regarding procurement will be published within next few weeks. OCS focusing on their specialisms of short term “burst” crisis response and reablement.
NCC have the same issues with social workers workforce in adult and children services. That is why we have to look long term and have set up the social work academy.

Q. Next Generation Council – are all the eggs in one basket for NCC in this model? Has NCC considered raising council tax above central government levels i.e. holding a referendum for a 15% increase as per another local authority?

Any council tax precepts will raise a nominal amount i.e. 1% is £2.4 million, 2% is £4.8 million.

As a council we have to keep looking and reviewing all the time how we do things.

NCC not considering holding a referendum for a council tax increase of 15% and it is considered unlikely public would agree to such an increase. Budgets run year on year and if public say ‘no’ then council will need to draft a further draft budget and go out and consult on revised budget again, which is timely and costly.

That is why we have a strong scrutiny process. This company will be subject to scrutiny.

NCC cannot overspend – that is why we use reserves and use capital receipts for transition to help us balance budgets within a given time.

Additional written questions/ comments submitted from Provider/Partner consultation session

[Name of Provider] at the moment have a contract with NCC for prevention work. I believe our contract may expire this year 2017. We have not heard when we need to retender the contract. Please provide us the commission contact details. Our contact is [name]

What IT software are you expecting other organisations to use in partnership with NCC?

Can day rates paid to Olympus be same rates as paid to Vol Sector for same services!!

Brokerage and Referral options needs to be outside and independent from Olympus and NASS

What will happen to the existing 4 years Framework that was issued in 2016?

Can there be some clarification on the “platforms”. What do we use breeze-e for?

What is the DPS for – purely expressions of interest and tendering?
C) Appendix 3 – Written Responses

Response 1: Healthwatch Northamptonshire

RE: Consultation on New Delivery Vehicle for Services to Vulnerable and Eligible Adults and their Carers

Following a special meeting of the Healthwatch Northamptonshire Adult Services Planning Group, which Carolyn Kus attended, we are pleased to submit the following response to the above mentioned consultation.

We acknowledge the difficult and challenging situation facing NCC, which includes:

- an increasing number of older people, who have a range of support needs
- an increasing number of people with disabilities and long term conditions
- a general increase in the overall population as a result of the significant current and projected housing development plans
- a challenging financial situation

You will agree, of course, that the foregoing does not preclude meaningful engagement and consultation – in fact it makes it ever more important.

In addition to the current consultation process on the proposed formal structural change, Healthwatch Northamptonshire urges the implementation of wider ongoing engagement and involvement of key stakeholders.

However, unfortunately we are aware a number of people, including carers and users of Olympus Care Day Services, have been concerned and upset at apparently not receiving any direct information about the proposed changes. This issue was raised at the consultation meeting held at the Gladstone Road Services Centre, where people reported this had led to real worries about the future of these services. We feel that:

(a) it would be helpful to have a close look at this situation and see what steps you could take for it to be corrected or improved, and

(b) it is imperative there is a commitment to a more inclusive approach to consultation processes, so that users, carers and other key stakeholders, feel both informed and empowered by having opportunities to make their views heard and influence decision makers

By way of comparison, you have a good and specific example of this approach in action, which has been in the area of Learning Disability, where there has been meaningful involvement through partnership boards, which has led to the identification of what has and hasn’t worked well, the development of new pathways, structures and ways of supporting and enabling people with learning disabilities to maximise their quality of life.

The “Consultation on New Delivery Vehicle for Services to Vulnerable and Eligible Adults and
their Carers” does not stand up well in comparison with the work on Learning Disability, and we therefore ask that you seek to take steps to bring the standard of engagement and consultation up to that of the work on Learning Disability.

Turning to current providers, we know that you agree – and see much opportunity in the future – for working in new and innovative ways with an increasingly diverse range of service providers. It is therefore vitally important there is the widest possible dialogue with current and potentially future providers of services, including the local voluntary and community sector organisations. These providers have a considerable level of expertise, and currently provide a considerable level of support at all levels, but particularly for those with lower level needs, including many people who have little or no immediate family support. As a result, they have excellent local connection and expertise which could be of real value to the authority.

We would therefore like to receive your assurance there will be a level playing field, with the opportunity for VCS providers to understand new priorities and develop appropriate changes to their services in line with the new agenda. In the past we have highlighted the sector’s value to communities. Many have excellent knowledge, links and confidence within their communities, and are able to attract additional resources to the county, which statutory bodies cannot access.

We warmly welcome the commitment made by Carolyn Kus, at a recent Healthwatch Northamptonshire Adult Services Group meeting, to work with the sector to look at the potential areas, including more complex situations, in which the VCS could work. We further understand there will be a dedicated workshop organised for this purpose, which approach we support and we look forward to that workshop being arranged in the near future.

However, Healthwatch Northamptonshire would like to express its concerns about the cost of implementation of the re-organisation, at a time when demand is high and budgets are challenged. We ask that these costs be reviewed and mitigated through appropriate actions.

Healthwatch Northamptonshire Volunteers also asked for reassurances that the restructure itself would not impact on areas such as:

- Employment of appropriately qualified and experienced staff carrying out assessments of need – at the right level of pay, the concern here being that an alternative structure based on lower pay and lack of relevant qualifications could result in the loss of high quality and committed staff and therefore compromise the quality of the service; it is understood that as the new structure is still technically part of the local authority such situations will not occur – but we seek your assurance on this matter.

- Restricting levels of support to individuals, without sufficient consideration of both need and safety.

Healthwatch Northamptonshire Board Members and Volunteers were pleased to learn that the highly publicized “intention” to charge those people with incomes above £23,250 an administration fee for assessments, has been clarified. We understand this administration charge is in fact not intended as a general charge for all assessments, which the wording in the consultation document was seen to have implied and which the Care Act 2014 does not
permit, but rather that it is intended that it is proposed to be applied to cover the administration costs in arranging for the care needs of those who have savings over the capital limit and who will, therefore, be funding their own care in any case.

We therefore, urge the authority to ensure there is an effective and pro-active publicity campaign to ensure people across the county are completely clear there are no proposals to make a general charge for adult social care assessments.

We ask that in so doing you also make it clear that even those who self fund should be aware they have an entitlement to an assessment if they appear to have needs, or at the very least a discussion with someone about the choices they have, and be signposted to reliable provider organisation(s) who can provide appropriate support services.

Similarly, those elderly people who live alone and have no family contact or networks are particularly vulnerable, so it is important they have ready access to reliable information about rights and entitlements, and who provides what, in order to prevent them falling victim to unscrupulous individuals and organisations.

Finally, we reiterate our call for wider engagement and involvement of individuals and different communities in the development of the new organisation and its role.

Response 2: Family Relative/ Carers Submission:
Please find our comments following the Consultation Meeting Held At Riverside Resource Centre on Wednesday 8th February 2017. Our son, [name], who has Downs Syndrome and severe learning difficulties attends the centre.

[name of customer]

Important socially and also increases his independence and social skills. Without it he would become a recluse.

The 10 years he has been at Riverside there has been a vast improvement in his development particularly in relation to his communication skills and social interaction. He participates in the sessions and enjoys going out in the community and has made many friends which he would not have otherwise have done. It is [name of customer]'s lifeline to as normal as possible a life.

He benefits from the "Riverside" family and it somewhere he know and feels safe.

Us as carers

Caring is a 24/7 job, the 5/6 hours a day he spends at Riverside enables us to have a break and get on with the day to day things. This time is about 20% of our time spent looking after [name of customer] and is crucial that we know and confident that he is being well cared for and we know he enjoys and benefits from the "Riverside" experience.

Riverside
Staff's unquestioned dedication to their obs. The person centred support and plans are developed in order to maximise the clients potential, wellbeing and social interaction. They manage to accommodate incredibly well the varying clients requirements treating them all as individuals and with dignity.

The management make this task seem easy and always can find time to discuss any problems with the clients and/or parents/ carers. A value you cannot put on this level of support and commitment, without which life would be more difficult and stressful for both the client and the carers.

Successful caring for [name of customer] requires a partnership approach from all concerned. Riverside certainly provides this and we know there is always a listening ear!

From both the client and carer perspective Riverside is a critically important facility, value which cannot be measured purely in financial terms.

**Response 3: Family Carer Submission**

Dear sir/madam,

I have attended the meeting at Gladstone Centre to get information about proposed changes to the Adult Care Services and the Introduction of NASS. The feedback at the meeting that there were concerns that the staff and facilities actually present with the clients may well be sacrificed and cut, whereas the number of background meetings by managers would be increased.

Please can you estimate the cost of the discussion of these changes, by:
- The Full Council,
- The Cabinet,
- The Group Leaders,
- The Group Board,
- The People Management Board
- The Commissioning Development Board,
- The Wellbeing Board,
- The Adults' Commissioning Board,
- The NASS Board,
- And the FFW Board.

It may be interesting, also, to let me have an estimate of the annual management costs before implementation, and your estimated management costs after.

Is there a Cost Saving involved in these changes, and if so, what are the amounts before and estimated costs after?

[name]
Carer

PS the online survey concerning the NASS Consultation crashed, and I copy to you the error detail.
Response 4: Provider

Dear Contract Team

Questions / queries from me:-

- I assume you [are] providing us access via a web link to your standardised assessment and tool?
- Is there a cost for us to use this?
- Will it be one generic access / login per provider? Or per home?
- How often are they expecting us to update?
- Will all / any reporting you require be done via the tool?
- Will the CCG’s be using the same standardised assessments and tool?

Kind regards
[name of officer] Senior Commercial Manager, Procurement
[name of company]
A report went to NCC Cabinet meeting in November 2016 that detailed the proposals around the new Target Operating Model.

Anyone can read the full report and its appendix as they are on the NCC website under Item 16 on this link – click here

https://cmis.northamptonshire.gov.uk/cmis5live/MeetingsCalendar/tabid/73/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/410/Meeting/2679/Committee/399/Default.aspx

The main points of the proposal are:

1) A new delivery vehicle is formed bringing together Adult Social Care and Olympus Care Services. The current proposal is that this organisation is called Northamptonshire Adult Social Services (NASS). NASS will be a company limited by guarantee and it will be a wholly owned subsidiary of the Council. NASS will directly deliver services, unless there is a need for highly specialist provision that is best provided by others. This will reduce the time and cost of external commissioning, removing the duplication of management costs, and give flexibility for swift change.

2) Under this umbrella there will be two organisations. Olympus Care Services will retain its income generation ability and NASS will cover all other activity. This will provide the opportunity to generate income and build on the already good foundation built by OCS for traded services. The Council can sell these services to other authorities to maximise income and incentivise the market.

3) NASS will provide opportunities to form joint arrangements with health partners for services to specific customer groups or cohorts.

4) The Council will commission NASS to deliver specified outcomes within a financial envelope. NASS’s performance will be monitored and be reported to the Council.

5) This arrangement will not transfer the accountability held by the Council to deliver its statutory and regulated functions for services to vulnerable to eligible adults and their carers, nor will it remove the statutory accountabilities of the lead member for adult services, nor the Director for Adults Social Services (the DASS).

6) It is anticipated that the new organisation will come into operation on 1st April 2017.

7) It is not anticipated that customers or service users will be impacted by any of these proposals, however this consultation is being carried out to ensure that everyone are fully aware and have the opportunity to question and contribute to the final plans.
Appendix 5 – Copy of the Online Questionnaire

The following is a copy of the text used for the online questionnaire.

Introduction

NASS will be a company limited by guarantee and it will be a wholly owned subsidiary of NCC Council. NASS will directly deliver services, unless there is a need for highly specialist provision that is best provided by others.

Northamptonshire Adults Social Services will be commissioned to deliver social care for vulnerable adults and their carers and families on behalf of the county council. The new organisation will seek to maximise resources, minimise overhead costs and reduce bureaucracy.

It will also include a trading arm, retaining the name and brand of Olympus Care Services, to generate income by selling services to other authorities.

An outline business case has already been put to the council’s cabinet in November 2016. A further business case, including feedback from this consultation, will be put before Cabinet in March 2017.

Your views gathered from this consultation will help to shape the business case and to further develop NASS.

Question 1

We are interested to know about how well you understand what the council is trying to achieve in setting up Northamptonshire Adult Social Services.

Can you help us by rating your understanding by using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is “Very Unclear Understanding” and “Very Clear Understanding”?

Please tick (√) relevant answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unclear</th>
<th>Very Clear</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1a

Please tell us why you gave it this rating?

Free text box

Question 2

Do you have any other comments that you would like to make?

Free text box
Question 3

If you would like to be more involved in shaping Northamptonshire Adult Social Services then please tell us your name and contact details. We will be in touch with you with further information about how you can assist us.

Your answers to this questionnaire will remain anonymous.

Please tick (V)

- I would like to join the Northamptonshire Adult Social Service customer reference group.  
  Yes ☐  No ☐

If you ticked the above box please give us your contact details. These will not be used in any way other than to contact you.

Name: 

Email address: 

Postal address: 

Telephone number:
F) Appendix 6 – Copy of the Consultation Event Presentations

Links to presentation material used at consultation events.

I. Provider/Partner Event - Click here

[Link]

II. Public Consultation Events - Click here
(This easy read presentation was created with the assistance of the Northamptonshire Learning Disability Partnership. Following feedback from the first consultation event held in the north of the county, 2 pictures were changed. The change in picture did not alter the content of the presentation but added clarity.)

[Link]
G) Appendix 7 – Copy of Self Serve Slide pack and Facilitator Feedback Collection Form

Presentation Slide Pack – [Click here]


Facilitator Feedback Collection Form

(Please view and share the accompanying slide pack and documents on the link below with you group before completing this feedback form www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/nassconsultation.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of facilitator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organisation/group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of the below customer categories best describes the participants?
(Please tick (v) all that apply)

- Older People
- Younger Adults
- Learning Disability
- Physical Disability
- Mental Health
- Carers
- Black or Minority Ethnic Group
- Prefer not to say

Other (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual equality monitoring forms completed? (Please refer to page 5).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(This is optional and if collected facilitators should allow participations to provide this information confidentially. Facilitators may wish to print and hand out individual sheets – hard copies can be provided upon request from <a href="mailto:epit@northamptonshire.gov.uk">epit@northamptonshire.gov.uk</a>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 1**

We are interested to know about how well you understand what the council is trying to achieve in setting up Northamptonshire Adult Social Services.

Can you help us by rating your understanding by using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is “Very Unclear Understanding” and 5 is a “Very Clear Understanding”

(Facilitators may wish to collect feedback to this question by either a show of hands for each scale or by obtaining a general consensus from the participants.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unclear</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very Clear</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please tick (V) relevant answer

Please tell us why you gave it this rating? *(free text box)*

**Question 2**

Do you have any other comments that you would like to make? *(free text box)*

**Question 3**

If you would like to be more involved in shaping Northamptonshire Adult Social Services then please tell us your name and contact details. We will be in touch with you with further information about how you can assist us.

Please tick (V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would like to join the Northamptonshire Adult Social Service customer reference group.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you ticked the “YES” above box please give us your contact details. These will not be used in any way other than to contact you.
Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return by the 16th February 2017 to. You can post to the address below or email epit@northamptonshire.gov.uk.

Engagement, Participation and Involvement Team
Northamptonshire County Council
County Hall
Northampton
NN1 1BR

**Optional About you (equality monitoring)**
It would be really helpful for us to know about the participants who are responding to this consultation. This will help us to make sure that we are talking to a diverse range of people. Completion of the monitoring information is voluntary.

1) What gender are you? (Please tick the appropriate box)
- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to say

2) Are you currently Pregnant or have you had a baby in the last 6 months? (Please tick the appropriate box)
- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

3) How old are you? (Please tick the appropriate box)
- 0 to 9
- 10 to 19
- 20 to 29
- 30 to 49
- 50 to 64
- 65 to 74
- 75+
- Prefer not to say

4) Do you have a disability? (Please tick the appropriate box)
- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

4a) If Yes, please tick the appropriate box(es) which best describes your disability?
- Mental Health
- Physical Disability
- Learning Disability
- Sight Impairment
- Hearing Impairment
- Other

5) What is your religion? (Please tick the appropriate box)
- None
- Muslim
- Sikh
- Hindu
- Buddhist
- Jewish
- Prefer not to say

Any other religion (please write in)

6) How would you describe your ethnic origin?
Tick one category within the option which best describes your background

**White**
- English
- Scottish
- Irish
- Other White Background

**Mixed / Multiple ethnic Background**
- White & Black Caribbean
- White & Black African
-

**Asian or Asian British**
- Indian
- Bangladeshi
- Other Asian Background
- Pakistani
- Chinese

**Black or Black British**
- Caribbean
- African
7) If you are 16 or over which of the following options best describes how you think of yourself? (Please tick the appropriate box)

- Bisexual
- Gay Man
- Gay Woman/Lesbian
- Heterosexual
- Prefer not to say

8) Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth? (Please tick the appropriate box)

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

9) What would you describe your marital status as? (Please tick the appropriate box)

- Married
- Widow/widower
- Single
- Other
- Civil Partnership
- Prefer not to say