

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham. S60 2TH

Date: Monday, 11th March, 2013

Time: 10.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with Part 1 (as amended March 2006) of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.
3. Apologies for Absence.
4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 25th February, 2013 (Pages 1 - 5)
5. Minutes of the Rotherham Safeguarding Adults Board (Pages 6 - 11)
6. Adult Services Revenue Budget Monitoring (Pages 12 - 17)

(The Chairman authorised consideration of the following item to enable the matter to be processed.)

7. Revision to Resources Allocation Systems (Pages 18 - 22)
8. Date and Time of Next Meeting -
- Monday, 15th April, 2013, at 10.00 a.m.

CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE
Monday, 25th February, 2013

Present:- Councillor Doyle (in the Chair); Councillor Gosling.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P. A. Russell and Steele.

H66. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11TH FEBRUARY, 2013

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th February, 2013.

Further to Minute No. H61 (Rotherham Carers' Charter and Joint Action Plan), it was noted that the Health and Wellbeing Board was to receive a report for information at its next meeting.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th February, 2013, be approved as a correct record.

H67. ROTHERHAM LEARNING DISABILITY PARTNERSHIP BOARD

The notes of the meeting of the Rotherham Learning Disability Partnership Board, held on 18th January, 2013, were noted.

H68. COMMUNITY AND HOME CARE ACTIVITY AND QUALITY REPORT FOR THE PERIOD 1ST OCTOBER TO 31ST DECEMBER 2012

The Strategic Commissioning Manager presented a report setting out the Community and Home Care Service activity for the period 1st October to 31st December, 2012 highlighting:-

- 1,257 Service users as at the end of December, 2012
- 201 had started to use the Service
- 152 had left the Service
- 9 users had taken up Direct Payment
- Reduction from 89% to 85% in residential care occupancy
- 15 users had returned home without a requirement for ongoing care from the Step-Up Step-Down Beds
- 20 recuperation beds provided at the Oakwood Community Hospital, 10 for transfer acute hospital beds and 10 from the community

The report also included information on the quality of contracted Community and Home Care Services including:-

- 34 contracting concerns closed:-
 - 3 Regarding conduct of staff
 - 2 Regarding medication

- 2 Regarding communication
- 2 Regarding quality of care recording and data protection
- 15 Regarding missed calls
- 6 Regarding timings or lateness of calls
- 3 Regarding quality of care provided
- Involved 9 domiciliary care providers
- 79 new contract concerns received in the third quarter with 36 remaining under investigation

Resolved:- That the report be received.

H69. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended March 2006) (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular individual (including the Council)).

H70. FEE SETTING 2013/14 - COMMUNITY AND HOME CARE SERVICES - INDEPENDENT SECTOR DOMICILIARY CARE

The Strategic Commissioning Manager presented a report proposing an increase in fees to Independent Sector Community and Home Care Services (Domiciliary Care) for 2013/14.

In the financial year 2012/13 the Council paid the CHCS Framework providers at the tendered value. The Framework was a 3 year contract (to March, 2015) and there was no obligation to uplift the contract hourly rate. However, it was understood that there were pressures on the sector and an inflationary uplift was warranted.

Discussion ensued on the proposal with the following issues highlighted:-

- Consultation with providers with regard to rate of pay for staff
- Effectiveness of the new Framework
- Referral numbers
- Neighbouring authorities' fees

Resolved:- That an inflationary uplift of 1.57% be approved for services commissioned through the Community and Home Care Services (Domiciliary Care) Framework for the financial year 2013/14.

(Exempt under Paragraph 3 of the Act - information relating to the financial or business affairs of any person (including the Council))

H71. OLDER PEOPLE SHORT TERM DAY CARE PROPOSALS

The Service Manager, Adult Community Services, reported on short term proposals to cease weekend and Bank Holidays for Day Care provision in Rotherham with a view to refocusing the provision of Day Service across Rotherham. Customers were choosing more personalised options which was leading to a change in demand for building-based Day Services.

The report set out 2 options for consideration:-

Option 1 – Cease the provision of day care at weekends and Bank Holidays at both Charnwood House and Copeland Lodge

Option 2 – Retain provision of day care on a Saturday at Copeland Lodge for EMI customers

Work had been carried out with customers who attending Social Day Care during the past 12 months to ascertain if they would benefit from attending the Service during the week. Whilst some customers had moved their weekend day to a day during the week others had chosen to retain their weekend provision. However, the low numbers did not justify the need for the building and staffing costs during a weekend.

It was a similar situation with regard to customer numbers in attendance during Bank Holidays as a large proportion spent time with family and friends.

Discussion ensued on the options with the following issues raised:-

- Transport costs
- Alternative provision at alternative sites in communities
- Personalisation/Direct Payment
-

Resolved:- That consultation take place on option 2 as outlined in the report submitted.

H72. TRANSPORT AND LEARNING DISABILITY DAY SERVICE CATERING - FINAL PROPOSALS

Further to Minute No. 19 of 23rd July, 2012, the Service Manager, Adult Community Services, submitted final proposals for Transport and Catering arrangements for the Learning Disability Day Care Service based on the recent consultation with customers and carers.

Transport Provision

Extensive work had been undertaken with a number of officers who were aware of customers and carers' needs to review the change to current transport provision.

Catering Provision

At present the current in-house Day Service catering arrangements, delivered on site, were underutilised by customers and therefore not cost effective. Recent consultation had shown that customers were accepting of the choice of taking their own packed lunch or purchasing a meal from the café.

Discussion ensued on the proposals with the following points highlighted:-

- The consultation had been extended to accommodate requests for one to one meetings and in response to a Legal Challenge by carers
- Questionnaires had been sent receiving a 30% return rate – the proposals were based on the questionnaire feedback
- Non-payment of transport

Resolved:- (1) That the consultation summary contained in the report submitted be noted.

(2) That the following be implemented as from April, 2013, in order to achieve the agreed savings and communication commence with customers and families:-

Transport Service

(a) That capacity within Neighbourhoods and Adult Services in-house Transport Services be utilised and implemented as from April, 2013.

(b) That the Autumn Service opening times be changed to allow for dual use of vehicles and that consultation take place with staff, HR and the Trade Unions.

(c) That vehicles currently used to transport customers to the SCOPE Day Centre be maximised.

(d) That it be noted that private hire arrangements would remain for those customers where other options were not sufficiently safe.

(e) The transfer of 1 contracted route/journey from an external operator to inhouse transport and that consultation be carried out with customers and families and the current provider.

(f) That the flat rate Day Centre Transport charge be increased from £1.00 to £2.50 for 2013/14, a 50p increase to £3.00 in 2014/15 and a further 50p increase to £3.50 in 2015/16.

(g) That consultation be carried out with Older People, who had previously not been consulted with, with regard to proposed increase.

(h) That additional vehicles be leased to enable customers to be transferred from private taxis to inhouse provision and that further work be undertaken to produce draft rotas for staff with a view to an implementation date of May, 2013.

Catering:-

(i) That current catering arrangements at Addison House and Oaks Day Centre cease.

(j) That it be noted that customer-led café facilities at both locations would be available to purchase hot snacks.

(3) That, following discussion with Legal Services, a further report be submitted on measures that could be taken to ensure payment of transport fees as far as possible.

H73. DEMENTIA CARERS SUPPORT WORKER SERVICE/ DEMENTIA CAFÉ TENDER - 2012/13

The Director of Health and Wellbeing reported on the results of the tender process for the delivery of a Dementia Carers Support Worker Service and Dementia Café Service to benefit adults with Dementia and their carers.

It was proposed that the contract be awarded for 3 years, commencing on 1st April, 2013 to 31st March, 2016.

The preferred provider was an expert and highly specialist Dementia care organisation with a good reputation for raising the profile of Dementia both nationally and locally. The tendered Service would provide upwards of 1,200 new referrals per annum and opportunities for the Dementia Café model to be rolled out to new locations as demand indicated.

Resolved;- That the Dementia Carers Support Worker Service and Dementia Café Service be awarded to the Alzheimer's Society.

(The approval of the Mayor was subsequently sought to exempt this item from the Council's call-in procedure)

Present:	
Professor Pat Cantrill	Independent Chair for the Safeguarding Adults Board
Jo Abbott	Consultant in Public Health NHS R
Dr Russell Brynes	GP Lead Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Sue Cassin	Lead Nurse NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group
Amanda Coyne	Mental Capacity and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards Co-ordinator RMBC
Cllr John Doyle	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care RMBC
Helen Dennis	Safeguarding Adults Co-ordinator RMBC
Juliette Greenwood	Chief Nurse Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust
Karen Hockley	Detective Inspector Rotherham Public Protection Unit SY Police
Mel Lambert	Team Manager Action for Children
Shona McFarlane	Director of Health and Wellbeing, RMBC
Nigel Mitchell	Learning and Development Manager RMBC
Phil Morris	Business Manager Children and Young People Service RMBC
Sam Newton	Safeguarding Adults Service Manager RMBC
Janine Parkin	Adults Commissioning Manager Resources RMBC (<i>rep for Matt Gladstone</i>)
Cllr Russell	Safeguarding Champion RMBC
Deborah Wildgoose	Deputy Director of Nursing RDaSH
Apologies:	
Val Allen	Voluntary and Community Sector Representative SCOPE
Lesley Dabell	Chief Executive Age UK Rotherham
Tracy Holmes	Head of Communications RMBC
Jill Jones	Homelessness Manager Housing Options RMBC
Dawn Peet	Safeguarding Officer South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
Amanda Thompson	Community Partnership Officer South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
John Williams	Service Manager Learning Disability Service RMBC
In Attendance:	
Carol Adamson	Community Engagement Officer RMBC
Nick Lynskey	Detective Sergeant South Yorkshire Police
Minutes:	
Ann Kirbyshaw	Safeguarding Adults Support Officer RMBC

Item		Action
1.	<p>Urgent matter raised at the request of the Chair</p> <p>Prior to the meeting commencing the Chair and Deborah Wildgoose advised they had a difficult issue to discuss with Board members but as there was a potential risk to the vulnerable adults living in Rotherham they felt it paramount to do so.</p> <p>Doncaster Safeguarding Adults Services had investigated a very complex case involving an alleged perpetrator who ran a very successful service user support service. There had been a number of allegations; the investigation had been ongoing for a year. As part of the investigation 400 people had been seen – the investigation was due to conclude over the next 2 months, at present all allegations were unfounded.</p>	

Item		Action
	<p>The alleged perpetrator had allegedly moved from Doncaster to Rotherham – there was a risk he could set up services in the Rotherham area. Karen Hockley was assured there had been no evidence of criminal activity.</p> <p>The Chair advised the major issue was protecting vulnerable people; it appeared the alleged perpetrator targeted those with mental health issues. Deborah Wildgoose advised the people had voluntarily engaged with this service, she added there had only been an alert to Rotherham and Sheffield, the alleged perpetrator may not decide to set up services in the area but there was a possibility he may. Phil Morris asked if the alert had been made across all agencies. Deborah Wildgoose responded no, it had to be established where he would be residing. The Chair explained Sam Newton had been given the name of the alleged perpetrator, she added it had been the Doncaster Safeguarding Adults Board who had made the decision to circulate the information.</p> <p>Karen Hockley stated if the police were aware they would be able to ‘flag up’ any concerns throughout South Yorkshire. Deborah Wildgoose explained the police had been provided with a recent update.</p> <p>The Chair advised concerns should be resolved shortly, an update would be provided at the next Board meeting in March.</p>	
2.	<p>Rotherham Vulnerable Persons Unit</p> <p><i>This item was linked with VARMM</i></p> <p>Carol Adamson explained she had been requested to attend the Board to deliver a presentation to raise awareness of the role of the unit.</p>	<p><i>Presentation attached</i></p>
3.	<p>VARMM – Vulnerable Adult Risk Management Matrix</p> <p>Helen Dennis explained there had been a meeting prior to Christmas to discuss adapting this tool which had been developed following a Serious Case Review in Sheffield. The tool was designed to evidence agencies had done all they could to support/assist those who did not meet the threshold to safeguarding or any other services.</p> <p>Helen Dennis advised the group was to meet again to prepare a paper for the next Board. The paper would outline the protocol e.g. identifying the appropriate person to convene a multi agency meeting to discuss the way forward, the chair of that meeting, where information should be shared etc.</p> <p>The Chair asked if voluntary organisations would be considered to attend meetings. Sam Newton advised voluntary organisations did not sit on the ‘Task and Finish’ group. Karen Hockley asked if the Probation Service had been considered. Sam Newton explained the Probation Service did not sit on the Board or the Sub Group but she suggested once completed the paper could be circulated to wider agencies for comment.</p> <p><i>MASH – Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub</i></p> <p>The aim of MASH was to locate a team of people who would work together and focus on the issues presented in order clarify any actions and to move issues faster within the investigation process. Hull had set up an Integrated Multi Disciplinary Team, Helen Dennis would be visiting to explore how it would work for Rotherham. The Chair suggested it was the ideal opportunity to gather information in an area the Board wished to research. She added the findings could be discussed when the Board met in March.</p>	<p><i>HDennis</i></p>
4.	<p>Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 07 November 2012</p>	

Item		Action
	The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true and accurate record of the proceedings.	
5.	<p>Matters Arising</p> <p>5.1 Winterbourne SCR Executive Summary and Action Plan</p> <p>Deborah Drury advised the Department of Health actions had been published on 10 December 2012, she explained RDaSH had very significant expectations of the outcome of the review. Sue Cassin explained the CCG had been looking at what the recommendations would mean to South Yorkshire. At a recent South Yorkshire and Humber meeting Rotherham had completed all they needed to.</p> <p>The Chair advised this issue was very current and a more detailed look at the recommendations was required. She proposed this issue would need to be placed on the next Board agenda.</p> <p>Deborah Wildgoose explained one of the elements of the action plan was to review the care of all the people placed out of Authority by 1 June 2013.</p> <p>5.2 Draft Communications Framework</p> <p>Tracey Holmes would be attending the next Board meeting to discuss this issue further.</p>	<i>Agenda Item</i>
6.	<p>South Yorkshire Safeguarding Adults Procedures</p> <p>Helen Dennis explained following the agreement of the other Local Authorities to the tendering process 3 expressions of interest had been received. Quotes were due to be returned on 15.01.2013 and an evaluation meeting would be held on 21.01.2013.</p> <p>The other aspect would now be preparation for a meeting to discuss the contents of the procedures. Rotherham was very keen to hold a multi agency meeting to ensure the content of the procedures would be from a multi agency perspective. Sam Newton advised it was crucial Rotherham should attend meetings with multi agency representation. In response to her request Members of the Board proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Juliette Greenwood – a member of her team ➤ Sue Cassin – Catherine Hall ➤ Deborah Wildgoose – would attend herself and would also represent Doncaster ➤ Mel Lambert agreed to attend as representative for the Voluntary Sector 	
7.	<p>Contract Assurance Activity – April 2012</p> <p>Janine Parkin explained this was the first report to Board, she had been unsure as to the expected content so had provided a snapshot of the activity. She had thought it useful to look at the substance of Contracting Concerns and how they had been dealt with. She explained the team worked closely with safeguarding ensuring any Contracting Concerns which had an element of safeguarding issues was passed on to the team to look at.</p> <p>Contracting Concerns are stored on a database and relate to potential practice issues by a provider who may or may not contract with the council. Contract Concerns can be raised via Assessment Direct.</p> <p>A risk matrix is updated monthly which generates a monthly RAG status against all registered providers. Information from the risk matrix is presented to a monthly</p>	

Item		Action
	<p>CQC meeting.</p> <p>Amanda Coyne discussed DoLS activity within care homes – some homes were not recognising when conditions had been met, the quality of recordings was questionable, re-applying for a DoL prior to it expiring etc. She suggested the sub group could look at what information needed capturing and agree a format as to how to illustrate information in the report.</p> <p>Janine Parkin suggested an end of year report could be presented to Board in May.</p>	<p><i>JParkin to present paper to May Board</i></p>
8.	<p>Care UK and Rotherham Hospice Representation at Board</p> <p>Sam Newton explained Paula Hill (Rotherham Hospice) had contacted her to make a formal request to become a member of the Board – she had also received a request from Care UK.</p> <p>Sue Cassin suggested questions could be asked relating to why they wanted to attend, what would they bring to the Board and take away.</p> <p>Following further discussion it was agreed the Board would give consideration to their attendance. This issue would be discussed further at the next Board meeting in March.</p>	<p><i>Agenda Item</i></p>
9.	<p>Safeguarding Adults Board Training – Executive and Non Executive</p> <p><i>This item was linked with Workforce Development</i></p> <p>Amanda Coyne made reference to the agreement made at the previous Board meeting i.e. funding – she explained she had been unable to present information to DLT. She would meet with Nigel Mitchell, Jo Abbott and Sue Cassin to work through a paper and assess what money was needed for next year.</p> <p>Jo Abbot discussed the lack of training for Board members, she reminded last year the Board had agreed to invite executives and non executives to sit in on training and to undertake case studies. Sue Cassin suggested a training plan specific to Board members would be beneficial, she made reference to the ‘Platinum’ training programme suggesting specific areas could probably be developed for Board members.</p> <p>Following discussion it was agreed the development of the Board would be of benefit and needed to be addressed via training. Nigel Mitchell advised this could be accommodated but the Board would need to be clear about their intended learning outcome and what training would provide the appropriate solution. He added a programme of training to match the national capability around Safeguarding Adults would be appropriate.</p> <p>The Chair suggested a pro forma to reflect the training needs of the Board. Nigel Mitchell suggested the self appraisal form could be utilised to reflect, consider and collate training needs.</p> <p>The Chair suggested an ‘Away Day’ could be used as a development event, she proposed the May Board meeting could be utilised. She added the Frances Report was due to be published at the end of January this would give Board members the chance to read it and to consider the impact it may have on the Boards as a whole.</p>	
10.	<p>Workforce Development</p> <p><i>Funding of Safeguarding Adults & Mental Capacity Act Training Programmes in 2013/2014</i></p>	

Item		Action
	<p><i>Safeguarding & Mental Capacity Act Trainer</i> – this post had been vacant since December – at present Nigel Mitchell was the key contact for this training.</p> <p><i>Work Programme January to March 2013</i> – the ‘Silver and Gold’ level training programmes have been commissioned with external training organisations -‘Gold’ (CQM Learning) and ‘Silver’ (Aspect) would take place.</p> <p>Nigel Mitchell advised all planned ‘Role of the Alerter’ training dates had been covered with minimum disruption and 6 additional dates had been added</p> <p><i>E-modules</i> – e-learning was accessible to those RDaSH employees who worked in the Rotherham area – unfortunately Doncaster was outside of the licensing agreement.</p> <p><i>Funding of Safeguarding Adults & Mental Capacity Act Training Programmes in 2013/2014</i></p> <p>Nigel Mitchell explained funding from the PCT to access MCA and DoLS training was due to end in March – the funding agreement had been £59,000-£60,000 per year. A meeting had been held between the Council and CCG to discuss future funding arrangement. Funding had been agreed at £47,000 for 2013/2014. A Service Level Agreement/pooled budget arrangement was to be drawn up.</p>	
11.	<p>Significant Safeguarding Issues</p> <p>CM – this home had a voluntary suspension of placements and a default notice in place. Work with the home was ongoing. None of the residents at CM were at risk of significant harm.</p> <p>BL – the concerns at BL appeared to be developing into significant concerns relating to whole areas of care. A meeting would take place with the provider next week – the view of the provider was they had made significant progress if the provider lifted the voluntary suspension then a formal suspension would be invoked and a default notice served. There had been 10 to 15 safeguarding issues which would be discussed at an MDT meeting.</p>	
12.	<p>Feedback from Safeguarding Adults Sub Group</p> <p>The last meeting had been cancelled due to an urgent meeting to discuss concerns relating to care home MC.</p>	
13.	<p>Domestic Violence</p> <p>An update relating to the Domestic Homicide Review was given. The perpetrator had been found guilty of manslaughter and had been given an 8 year jail sentence. The DHR could now be concluded, the review was planned for February 2013 but unfortunately the author of the report was currently on sick leave.</p> <p><i>Independent Domestic Violence Advocate</i> – Helen Dennis advised funding for this post would need to be applied for from the Police and Crime Commission.</p>	
14.	<p>360° Appraisal Questionnaire – Update and Review</p> <p>Shona McFarlane explained the questionnaire related to the qualities of the Chair – consideration should now be given to refresh information therefore she proposed the Chair and Board members table this agenda item for discussion. Deborah Wildgoose suggested all Board members had accepted the 360° appraisal formed part of their work. All agreed.</p> <p>Karen Hockley suggested if adapted the questions may prove to be of benefit to Board members. Shona McFarlane agreed, she added self appraisal was in the Board’s constitution and formed part of the framework for expectations of Board</p>	

Item		Action
	<p>members. Sue Cassin suggested the appraisal could also link to applications for Board membership.</p> <p>The Chair advised both exercises would form part of the Board's strategy to ensure they were 'ticking all the right boxes'.</p>	
15.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>15.1 Jimmy Saville</p> <p>Sue Cassin explained following the significant allegations against 3 NHS organisations the DofH had decided to hold a review into Jimmy Saville's role within health regulations. The Secretary of State had appointed a barrister to provide assurance the DofH and the relevant NHS organisations would be following a robust process aimed at protecting the interests of patients.</p> <p>The paper she had prepared outlined the safeguarding arrangements and raising awareness. She assured the Board the CCG had taken this issue very seriously.</p> <p>15.2 Karen Hockley</p> <p>Karen Hockley advises she would be leaving Rotherham PPU to work at Sheffield PPU on 11.02.2013. Mark Montiero would be replacing her.</p> <p>On behalf of the Board the Chair thanked her for her contribution to Board, she was a valuable member who would be missed.</p> <p>15.3 Annual Report</p> <p>Sam Newton made reference to the Annual Report. It was agreed the March meeting would be condensed and the rest given over to discussion/preparation/contribution of Board members to the report.</p>	<p><i>Paper to be circulated with minutes by AKirbyshaw</i></p>
16.	<p>Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting</p> <p>Date: 6 March 2013</p> <p>Time: 9am to 12 noon</p> <p>Venue: Riverside House Floor 2 Meeting Room 21</p>	

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
2	Date:	Monday 11th March 2013
3	Title:	Adult Services Revenue Budget Monitoring Report 2012-13
4	Directorate :	Neighbourhoods and Adult Social Services

5 Summary

This Budget Monitoring Report provides a financial forecast for the Adult Services Department within the Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Directorate to the end of March 2013 based on actual income and expenditure for the period ending 31 January 2013.

The forecast for the financial year 2012/13 at this stage is an overall underspend of £352k, against an approved net revenue budget of £71.445m, an increase in the underspend of £170k since last months report.

6 Recommendations

That the Cabinet Member receives and notes the latest financial projection against budget for 2012/13.

7 Proposals and Details

7.1 The Current Position

The approved net revenue budget for Adult Services for 2012/13 was £74.147m. Included in the approved budget was additional funding for demographic and existing budget pressures (£2.294m) together with a number of savings (£6.258m) identified through the 2012/13 budget setting process.

7.1.1 The table below summarises the latest forecast outturn against approved budgets:-

Division of Service	Net Budget	Forecast Outturn	Variation	Variation
	£000	£000	£000	%
Adults General	1,829	1,819	-10	-0.54
Older People	32,828	32,038	-790	-2.41
Learning Disabilities	17,283	17,942	+659	+3.81
Mental Health	5,408	5,404	-4	-0.07
Physical & Sensory Disabilities	6,223	6,043	-180	-2.89
Safeguarding	711	684	-27	-3.80
Supporting People	7,163	7,163	0	0
Total Adult Services	71,445	71,093	-352	-0.49

7.1.2 The latest year end forecast shows there are a number of underlying budget pressures mainly in respect of an increase in demand for Direct Payments (+£1.693m) across all client groups plus pressures on residential care and external transport provision within Learning Disability services (+£669k). These pressures are being offset by a number of forecast non recurrent underspends together with management actions.

Since the last report the net budget has reduced to reflect the realignment of procurement savings and associated costs. Non recurrent winter pressures funding has also been received from Health, which is the main reason for the increase in the overall underspend.

The main variations against approved budget for each service area can be summarised as follows:

Adults General, Management & Training (-£10k)

This includes the cross cutting budgets (Workforce planning and training, and corporate charges) are forecasting an overall slight under spend mainly due to savings on postages and telephone charges.

Older People (-£790k)

- Overspend on In-House Residential Care due to a recurrent budget pressure on Part III income (+£92k) plus additional staffing costs due to sickness cover at Davies Court, reduced by non recurrent winter pressures funding (+£17k).
- Increase in Direct Payments over budget (+£989k), this includes 112 new clients since April most of which are clients who previously received independent sector domiciliary care and have requested to remain with their current service provider.
- Overspend on In House Transport (+£48k) due to slippage on the approved budget savings from the review of Transport services and agency costs to cover sickness, partially reduced by additional income.
- Forecast under spend on Enabling Care (-£331k) based on current budget and level of service which is under review. However, there is now a forecast overspend on Independent sector home care (+£92k) due to increased activity over the last few months. This is after a reduction of £655k commissioning and contract savings achieved as part of the new framework agreement. These budgets have now been revised to partly address the shift in service provision to Direct payments as mentioned above.
- An underspend on independent residential and nursing care (-£478k) due to 49 less clients receiving service than budgeted. More self funders receiving care is resulting in a reduction in the average cost per client plus additional income from health.
- Forecast under spend at this stage in respect of Community Mental Health budgets uncommitted including slippage in developing dementia services (-£225k).
- Under spend on carers services due to vacancies and slippage in carers breaks (-£183k), reducing pressures on direct payments.
- Forecast slippage on Assistive Technology based on spend to date against approved budget (-£150k).
- Slippage on recruitment to vacant posts within Assessment & Care Management and community support plus additional income from Health Including winter pressures funding (-£323k).
- Savings from the review of day care provision (-£173k).
- Overall under spend on Rothercare (-£129k) due to slippage in service review including options for replacement of alarms.
- General savings on premises and supplies and services due to moratorium on non essential spend (-£36k).

Learning Disabilities (+£659k)

- Overspend on independent sector residential care budgets due increase in clients and average cost of care packages plus loss of income from health, reduced by lower activity on respite care (+£496k).
- Underspend within supported living schemes due to CHC income, use of one off grant funding and vacant posts (-£306k).

- Recurrent budget pressure on Day Care transport (+£258k) including income from charges reduced by under spend on in house day care due to vacant posts and savings on supplies and services as part of the review of service (-£85k).
- Increase in demand for Direct Payments over and above budget (+£106k).
- Forecast overspend in independent sector home care (+£76k) due to slippage in meeting budget savings agreed as part of budget setting.
- Three new high cost placements in independent day care is resulting in a forecast overspend of +£67k.
- Increase in community support placements is resulting in a forecast overspend of £67k.
- Saving on premises costs and supplies and services as a result of the moratorium (-£20k).

Mental Health (-£4k)

- Projected slight under spend on residential care budget (-£19k) due to more discharges last month, including high cost care packages.
- Budget pressure on Direct Payments (+£136k) offset by savings on Community Support Services (-£157k).
- Overspends on employees budgets due to unmet vacancy factor and use of agency staff (+£36k).

Physical & Sensory Disabilities (-£180k)

- Continued Pressure on Independent Sector domiciliary care (+£66k) due to continued increase in demand for service.
- Loss of CHC funding for one client at Rig Drive (+£52k) being challenged and awaiting outcome of an appeal.
- Increase in demand for Direct Payments (+ 33 clients), forecast overspend (+£463k).
- Underspend on crossroads (-£61k) as clients are redirected to direct payments.
- Forecast overspend on Residential and Nursing care offset by slippage in developing alternatives to residential provision (-£530k).
- Vacant posts within Resource centre and Occupational Therapists (-£43k).
- Underspend on equipment budget (-£75k) and savings due to vacant part-time post at Grafton House (-£15k).
- Review of contracts with independent Day Care providers (-£25k).
- Forecast savings on contracts with Voluntary Sector providers (-£12k).

Safeguarding (-£27k)

- Underspend on employee budgets due to vacant post plus forecast additional income from court of protection fees.

Supporting People (£0k)

- Efficiency savings of £234k on subsidy contracts are being offset against commissioning savings targets and therefore not reported within Adult Services.

7.1.3 Agency and Consultancy

Total expenditure on Agency staff for Adult Services for the period ending January 2013 was £307,394 (none of which was off contract). This compares with an actual cost of £287,674 for the same period last year (of which £1,974 was off contract). Primarily, these costs were in respect of residential and assessment and care management staff to cover vacancies and sickness.

There has been no expenditure on consultancy to-date.

7.1.4 Non contractual Overtime

Actual expenditure in respect of non contractual overtime to the end of January 2013 was £329,783 compared with £266,295 for the same period last year.

The actual costs of both Agency and non contractual overtime are included within the financial forecasts.

7.2 Current Action

To mitigate any further financial pressures within the service, budget meetings and budget clinics are held with Service Directors and managers on a regular basis to monitor financial performance and further examine significant variations against the approved budget to ensure expenditure remains within the cash limited budget by the end of the financial year.

8. Finance

Finance details including main reasons for variance from budget are included in section 7 above.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Careful scrutiny of expenditure and income and close budget monitoring remains essential to ensure equity of service provision for adults across the Borough within existing budgets particularly where the demand and spend is difficult to predict in such a volatile social care market. One potential risk is the future number and cost of transitional placements from children's services into Learning Disability services.

In addition, any future reductions in continuing health care funding would have a significant impact on residential and domiciliary care budgets across Adult Social Care.

Regional Benchmarking within the Yorkshire and Humberside region for the six month period ending September 2012 shows that Rotherham is slightly below average on spend per head in respect of continuing health care.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The delivery of Adult Services within its approved cash limit is vital to achieving the objectives of the Council and the CSCI Outcomes Framework for Performance Assessment of Adult Social Care. Financial performance is also a key element within the assessment of the Council's overall performance.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- Report to Cabinet on 22 February 2012 –Proposed Revenue Budget and Council Tax for 2012/13.
- The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2011-2014.

This report has been discussed with the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services, the Director of Health and Well Being and the Director of Financial Services.

Contact Name: Mark Scarrott – Finance Manager (Neighbourhoods and Adult Services), *Financial Services x 22007, email Mark.Scarrott@rotherham.gov.uk.*

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
2.	Date:	15 th April 2013
3.	Title:	Review of the Resource Allocation System (RAS) to take account of inflation.
4.	Directorate:	Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

5. **Summary**

- 5.1 This report sets out a proposal to increase the Resource Allocation System (RAS) scorecard to reflect the impact of inflation.

6. **Recommendations**

- 6.1 **It is recommended that the RAS scorecard is increased by 1.57% for the financial year 2013/14. The rates are as set out in Appendix 1**

7. Proposals and Details

- 7.1 The aim of the Resource Allocation System (RAS), linked to the allocation of personal budgets, is to provide a clear and rational way to calculate how much money it is likely to cost to meet a persons assessed needs.
- 7.2 The RAS is made up of a series of questions which are used to determine a person's assessed needs. Each question carries a point score, the points are weighted to take account of levels of dependency. The total points are converted into an 'indicative cash allocation'. This is an approximate amount of money which is likely to be needed to meet a person's outcomes as determined in their support plan.
- 7.3 In April 2010 Rotherham adopted the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS) common resource allocation framework. This framework includes a scorecard which allocates a cash figure to a range of points. Following a pilot exercise the ADASS RAS was calibrated to take account of Rotherham's Adult Social Care budget.
- 7.4 The RAS has to be revised each year to take account of changes in social care budgets and support costs. It should take account of key cost drivers affecting personal budgets and not just the overall adult social care budget. The ADASS framework advises that future proofing the RAS will need to be determined locally taking account of the local financial climate.
- 7.5 At the moment the key cost drivers are the costs of independent sector community based services. The Council's inflation provision for these cost drivers has been increased by an average of 1.57% and it is therefore proposed that this level of increase is applied to the RAS scorecard.

8. Finance

- 8.1 The costs of this increase have been included in the MTFs.
- 8.2 This proposal should not affect the Directorate's ability to achieve its savings proposal 'More effective use of Personal Budgets £500,000'. This savings proposal is associated with utilising the RAS to develop more innovative cost effective ways of meeting people's needs.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

- 9.1 There are no risks associated with this proposal.
- 9.2 This will enable the Council to continue to provide sufficient funding to meet an individuals assessed need.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

- 10.1 Agreement to this proposal will enable the Council to continue to meet its commitment to the Putting People First personalisation agenda.

11. **Background Papers and Consultation**

11.1 ADASS Common Resource allocation framework October 2009

11.2 The Councils MTFS Plan 2012 and beyond

11.3 This proposals have been discussed with the Strategic Director of Finance

Contact Name ; : Doug Parkes Principal Finance Officer ext 23927 e. mail
Doug.parkes@rotherham.gov.uk

Resource Allocation System - Scorecard April 2013

Score	2010 £ per pt	2011 £ per pt	2012 £ per pt	Score	2010 £ per pt	2011 £ per pt	2012 £ per pt	Score	2010 £ per pt	2011 £ per pt	2012 £ per pt	Score	2010 £ per pt	2011 £ per pt	2012 £ per pt	Score	2010 £ per pt	2011 £ per pt	2012 £ per pt
2	£6	£6	£6	42	£70	£71	£72	41	£252	£258	£262	122	£556	£568	£577	162	£978	£1,001	£1,016
4	£6	£6	£6	44	£76	£77	£79	42	£264	£270	£274	124	£574	£587	£596	164	£1,002	£1,025	£1,041
6	£7	£7	£7	46	£82	£83	£85	43	£277	£284	£288	126	£592	£605	£615	166	£1,027	£1,051	£1,068
8	£8	£9	£9	48	£89	£91	£92	88	£290	£297	£302	128	£611	£625	£635	168	£1,052	£1,077	£1,094
10	£10	£10	£10	50	£96	£98	£100	90	£304	£311	£316	130	£630	£645	£655	170	£1,078	£1,103	£1,120
12	£11	£11	£11	52	£103	£106	£107	92	£317	£324	£329	132	£649	£664	£675	172	£1,103	£1,128	£1,146
14	£12	£12	£12	54	£112	£114	£116	94	£330	£338	£343	134	£670	£685	£696	174	£1,128	£1,154	£1,172
16	£14	£15	£15	56	£120	£123	£125	96	£344	£352	£358	136	£690	£706	£717	176	£1,154	£1,181	£1,200
18	£17	£17	£17	58	£128	£131	£133	98	£359	£367	£373	138	£710	£727	£738	178	£1,181	£1,208	£1,227
20	£19	£20	£20	60	£137	£140	£142	100	£373	£382	£388	140	£731	£748	£759	180	£1,207	£1,235	£1,255
22	£23	£23	£24	62	£145	£149	£151	102	£389	£398	£404	142	£751	£769	£781	182	£1,235	£1,263	£1,283
24	£26	£27	£27	64	£155	£158	£161	104	£404	£414	£420	144	£773	£791	£803	184	£1,262	£1,292	£1,312
26	£30	£31	£31	66	£164	£168	£171	106	£420	£430	£436	146	£794	£813	£826	186	£1,290	£1,320	£1,341
28	£34	£34	£35	68	£174	£178	£181	108	£436	£446	£453	148	£816	£835	£848	188	£1,318	£1,348	£1,369
30	£37	£38	£39	70	£185	£189	£192	110	£451	£462	£469	150	£839	£858	£872	190	£1,345	£1,376	£1,398
32	£42	£43	£44	72	£196	£200	£203	112	£468	£479	£486	152	£862	£882	£895	192	£1,374	£1,406	£1,428
34	£47	£48	£49	74	£206	£211	£215	114	£485	£496	£504	154	£884	£905	£919	194	£1,403	£1,435	£1,458
36	£52	£53	£54	76	£217	£222	£226	116	£502	£513	£521	156	£907	£928	£943	196	£1,432	£1,465	£1,488
38	£58	£59	£60	78	£228	£233	£237	118	£520	£532	£540	158	£930	£952	£967	198	£1,462	£1,496	£1,519
40	£64	£65	£66	80	£240	£246	£249	120	£538	£550	£559	160	£954	£976	£991	200	£1,500	£1,535	£1,559

