

## ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

<b>1. Meeting:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>
<b>2. Date:</b>	<b>19<sup>th</sup> June 2013</b>
<b>3. Title:</b>	<b>Scrutiny Review of RMBC Residential Homes</b>
<b>4. Directorate:</b>	<b>Resources</b>

### **5. Summary**

This report sets out the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of RMBC Residential Homes. The full report is attached as Appendix 1 and was endorsed by the Health Select Commission and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at their meetings on 18<sup>th</sup> April and 24<sup>th</sup> May 2013 respectively.

### **6. Recommendations**

#### **That Cabinet:**

- **Receives the report;**
- **Feeds its response back to OSMB within two months.**

## 7. Proposals and Details

This review was identified in the work programme for 2012/13 and was prioritised by both Scrutiny Members and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care. In light of the budget pressures being faced by the Council and the need to identify further budget cuts it was felt that an independent view on the future of the homes was required. It took place, alongside a financial review, commissioned by Neighbourhoods and Adults Services management, and delivered by Price Waterhouse Cooper. It was intended that the Scrutiny review would add value to the work carried out by PWC and to allow a wider range of discussion to take place about the future of the homes.

The overall aim of the review was to achieve an understanding of value for money, outcomes and quality of service provision and in particular, the potential impact of budget cuts on this. The review would make recommendations to the Executive to be considered alongside the process of setting and reviewing the budget for 2013/14.

It would also aim to support the achievement of the following Council priorities from the Corporate Plan:

- Ensuring care and protection are available for those people who need it most
- Helping to create safe and healthy communities.

The review is reported under the five sub headings; staffing, catering and entertainment, buildings and maintenance, costs and comparisons and options for the future. Each of these sections of the review has its own recommendations. There are 10 recommendations in total, listed below.

1. That RMBC corporately agrees to review the terms and conditions of the staff to address issues of out of hours enhancements and sickness absence payments.
2. That Human Resources and NAS Management consider urgently whether the permanent recruitment freeze could be lifted for the two homes, enabling them to take more control of some of the staffing costs.
3. That the hard work and commitment of the staff and managers of both homes be recognised and the achievements made in enhancing the dignity of residents.
4. To provide the opportunity for the teams to explore this further and to generate independent income for the homes to enhance the experience for residents and to ensure that quality of provision is maintained as far as possible. This might also include some independent management of procurement for food and catering items.
5. That further work is done with the procurement team of the Council to look at value for money in the current contractual arrangements and a review of how the food budgets are spent is carried out in conjunction with the managers of the homes.
6. That consideration is given to the extent to which the handyman service or another internal employee could be trained to carry out some of the maintenance services

that are currently causing the homes to go over their repairs and maintenance budgets.

7. That the same review contained within recommendation 5 for food procurement is carried out regard to procurement of cleaning, repairs and maintenance services
8. Cabinet do not cut staff hours per resident below 25 as it is felt this will be to the detriment of the quality of the service provided.
9. That Cabinet re-consider the proposal to reduce the number of managers within the homes, as this is likely to result in re-deployment and payment protection costs which could outweigh the savings being made.
10. That the Council looks at alternative ways to manage the capital costs and borrowing associated with this, which potential remove the burden from the revenue budgets of the homes.

## **8. Finance**

The review recommendations will need to be considered in the context of the agreed budget for 2013/14

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

The review group considered at length the risks around reducing costs and the potential impact on quality. This potential “trade off” between cost savings and quality was at the heart of the review.

## **10. Contact**

Deborah Fellowes  
Scrutiny Manager

Ext 22769

[Deborah.fellowes@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Deborah.fellowes@rotherham.gov.uk)