

MINUTES of a meeting of the **CABINET MEMBER – ADULT SOCIAL CARE** held on 29 October 2015 at County Hall, Matlock.

PRESENT

Councillor P Smith (in the Chair)

Also in attendance were Councillors R Davison and P Jones.

31/15 **MINUTES** **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Cabinet Member.

32/15 **REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING PERIOD 5** The Cabinet Member was provided with an update of the Adult Care Revenue Budget position for 2015-16 up to the end of August (period 5).

The Revenue Budget Monitoring Statement prepared at period 5 indicated that there was a projected year end overspend of £5.754m. The significant areas which made up this projection were shown in the table below:

	Controllable Budget	Full Year Forecast	Forecast (Under)/Over Spend
	£m	£m	£m
Strategic Director (See Note 1)	1.897	2.947	1.050
Purchased Services - including Fieldwork and Direct Care (See Note 2)	184.352	190.438	6.086
Strategy and Commissioning	16.297	15.048	(1.249)
Miscellaneous	0.715	0.582	(0.133)
Total	203.261	209.015	5.754

- Note 1: This included the additional £3m one-off funding agreed as part of the 5 Year Financial Plan report on 15th July 2014.
- Note 2: Purchased Services were defined as 'Agreements for provision of services, primarily residential and nursing care, day care, home care, direct payments and other community services, for individuals by providers, both in-house and independent sector'.

Budget reductions totalling £24.216m were allocated for the year, with a brought forward figure from 2013-14 of (£0.265m) to give an overall target of £23.952m. It was anticipated that £22.025m would have been achieved by the year end. The table below shows performance against the target.

Budget Cut Target	Budget Reduction Amount £m	Projected Amount Achieved £m	Not Achieved £m
Supported Living Schemes	1.728	1.204	0.524
Frozen Meals and Laundry	0.000	0.112	(0.112)
Transport	0.000	0.101	(0.101)
FACS to Substantial	0.650	0.852	(0.202)
Cut Grants to Vol Orgs	1.610	1.610	0.000
Housing Related Support	6.576	5.478	1.098
Consolidate Block Contracts	0.300	0.300	0.000
Community Equipment	0.290	0.000	0.290
Review "No AA/DLA" Clients	0.145	0.000	0.145
Co-Funding Contributions	3.816	3.816	0.000
Review S117 Cases	0.050	0.000	0.050
Consistent Application of the RAS	8.000	8.000	0.000
Reduction in Leadership	0.000	0.089	(0.089)
Direct Care Trading Income	0.100	0.463	(0.363)
Reduction in Business Services	0.050	0.000	0.050
Balancing Figure	0.637	0.000	0.636
Total	23.952	22.025	1.927

Earmarked reserves totalling £1.525m were currently held to support future expenditure. Details of these reserves were shown below:

	Amount £m
Adult Care Replacement ICT System	0.250
Care Home – Backdated Fees	1.275
Total Earmarked Reserves	1.525

RESOLVED to note the position with the 2015-16 Revenue Budget.

33/15 LEARNING DISABILITY PARTNERSHIP BOARD BUDGET

Approval was sought to the Learning Disability Partnership Board (LDPB) Budget for 2015-16 in the sum of £ 28,000 and for a small budget to be set aside for the County Board to allocate start-up grants for social activities for people with learning disabilities; Task Force events and conferences.

The function of the County LDPB and the local LDPBs was to advocate for the views of people with learning disabilities and family carers.

The terms of reference for the County Board were detailed in the Strategic Director's report

The Board structure was very important as the authority needed to co-produce, engage and involve with people with learning disabilities and family carers regarding their views on current support and service changes in both health and social care.

The Boards had been supported in this role for a number of years in two main ways, fees to individuals attending the County Board and support costs for the meetings.

A fee of £250 per annum was paid to the elected learning disability representatives (self advocates) and also to family carer representatives who attend the LDPB meetings.

There were six local Boards and each Board had up to four self advocates and four family carer representatives, apart from two areas where districts were combined. These were North East and Bolsover, and High Peak and Derbyshire Dales, where there were spaces for eight self advocates and eight family carer representatives. The total cost of fees was £16,000 per annum.

Additionally each local Board and the County Board had a budget to cover room hire; and refreshments and transport costs for representatives to attend meetings. This budget also covered costs associated with one off events and county wide Task Force meetings which occurred two or three times a year.

It was timely to clarify the purpose of the Board expenses. The principles on which this report was based had been agreed with the chair of the County Board.

The County Board had been made aware that the budget was being looked at and that certain changes were being put forward for agreement.

The budget for fees to representatives had been administered separately and this would continue.

Within the terms of reference for the Boards, there was scope to sponsor and pay for initiatives that develop awareness of the needs of people with learning disabilities. An example would be start-up funding for an evening social group.

It was proposed that in future any such grants should be restricted for County Board consideration. Local boards would be required to make a case to the County Board to request the making of such grants. Given the council's financial position, it was recommended that such payments should be limited to a maximum of £250 and be signed off by the Assistant Director who attends the County Board. There should be an annual limit on such funding of £2,000 in total.

The grants should:

- Be for the benefit of people with learning disabilities
- Have local or countywide benefit
- Have measurable outcomes which should be reported to the Board
- Be a one off payment
- Not be paid to an existing organisation
- Only be made if the funding is not available from any other source

The budget proposal was set out below

Self Advocate and Elected carer fees (8 per Derbyshire district) This includes fee for independent chair of County Board	£16,250
County Board budget for refreshments, transport, Task Force one off events and start up grants (this element to be a maximum of £2,000 per year)	£5,140
Local Boards budget for travel and other expenses (based on spend in 2014-15)	£6,610
Total	£28,000

This could be met from the Learning Disabilities Development Fund budget.

RESOLVED (1) to approve the Learning Disability Partnership Board Budget (LDPB) for 2015-16 in the sum of £28,000; and.

(2) to approve a small budget to be set aside for the County Board to allocate start-up grants up to a maximum of £250 per grant for social activities for people with learning disabilities, with the total sum to be allocated per year to be no more than £2,000; and

(3) that Local Boards may make grant requests of up to £250 for consideration by the CLDPB. Such requests must be accompanied by the minutes of the LB meeting and state the benefit to people with learning disabilities. The request would be considered and decided by the next

CLDPB. In urgent cases the Chair and Co-Chair of the CLDPB shall be empowered to decide the application, with a report back to the next meeting

34/15 RENEWAL OF CONTRACT FOR THE LICENSE AND SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESOURCE ALLOCATION SYSTEM (RAS) Approval was sought to renew the contract with FACE for the provision of the FACE RAS and related assessment forms (the service) for a further 3 years in accordance with Protocol 10 of Financial Regulations.

The FACE (Functional Assessment of Care Environments) Core Assessment Package was originally purchased from FACE Recording and Measurement Systems by the then Social Services Department in 2005 at a cost of £10,000 per annum. In 2008 with the advent of personalisation, the Adult Care Department worked with FACE on developing the RAS (Resource Allocations System).

The advantages of this option were:

- It was based on the use of FACE assessment tools that are already well validated and integrated into routine practice. Some staff were already familiar with the FACE assessment tool.
- It is a scientific, whole system approach based on a thorough analysis of representative samples of data. The scoring system used controls for local variation by taking representative samples of assessment data from a range of areas, involving all key stakeholders and distilling a method of scoring that best fits the data.
- The project was jointly led by David Challis and Paul Clifford of FACE and David Challis was Professor of Community Care at the Personal Social Services Research Unit, University of Manchester. The latter was involved in the Department of Health evaluation of the Personal Budget pilots. Consequently, the FACE/RAS programme has been developed to address what is required as evidenced by the pilots as well as the requirements of national policy.
- It built on existing Single Assessment Process/Common Assessment Framework processes.

The FACE RAS software package was introduced in April 2010 on a pilot basis and since April 2011 has been fully integrated for use by all staff in Adult Care to calculate indicative budgets.

The adoption of the FACE RAS tool has been a major contributor in delivering consistency and transparency in assessment and enabling Adult Care to meet its budget considerations.

There were two elements to the contract with FACE Recording and Measurement Systems; these were a) the license and b) the support. The

original contract with FACE for their assessment tools and support was for 3 years from April 2005 until April 2008.

At the time of purchase of the system procurement processes were not appropriate as the package had been jointly developed by DCC and FACE and there was therefore no other potential supplier.

Since 2011 the contract had been further extended on a number of occasions. The initial extension was for a period of 3 years from April 2008 at a cost of £20,000 per annum. This extension included the development work for the new RAS. The contract was then renewed in April 2011 for one year at a cost of £25,000 per annum and then extended to January 2016.

Allocation via the RAS remains an essential element of the Department's allocation system. FACE was developed in response to perceived inadequacies with simple points based systems. It was based on a series of algorithms which sat behind the assessment documentation and look at not only the clients' performance within certain life domains/activities of daily living but also where these impacted on related life areas. This avoids double scoring as successful completion of a particular activity can be compared against completion of activities that demand similar actions and also provided a quality check for the assessment as a whole. The FACE system, as it had been developed, was accurate, intuitive (in that the professional chooses from a series of statements to identify the best fit with the clients' situation) and was fully integrated into DCC documentation and processes.

Market testing has been undertaken with other local authorities but the market remains substantially unchanged and no other supplier has been identified that would fulfil the Department's immediate and likely future requirements. The only potential alternative to the FACE RAS would be:

- Developing an in-house RAS. This would require a significant amount of officer time and technical know-how that is beyond existing resources.
- The procurement of an 'In Control' model: This is an alternative resource allocation system. However it is unable to provide the required degree of correlation between actual package costs and personal budgets.

Neither of these options would therefore deliver the level of accuracy provided by the current approach and both would require significant development time. The current RAS was fully integrated in to the existing Adult Care customer/ client pathway and calibrated to DCC Adult care requirements. It was a bespoke system; the authority did not own the intellectual property rights, therefore making it difficult to facilitate a smooth transition for the procurement of a different system. Furthermore, any changes

to approach would require a costly and disruptive re-training of operational staff.

Consequently this placed FACE in the position of specialist/sole single supplier in so far as it would not be possible in the current market to procure a comparable system from elsewhere.

The costs of the proposed extension of the contract for licenses and support are as follows:

		Assessments	RAS	Total	Costs exclude VAT	
Year 1	2016 -17	£16,699	£28,137	£44,836		
Year 2	2017 -18	£16,933	£28,531	£45,464		
Year 3	2018 -19	£17,170	£28,930	£46,100	3 Year total	£136,400

The above costs would be met from within the existing Adult Care Budget. The Director of Finance was satisfied that the proposed extension represented best value to the Council in the circumstances set out.

RESOLVED (1) to approve the extension of the contract with FACE Recording and Management Systems for a period of 3 years from January 2016 in accordance with Protocol 10 of Financial Regulations; and

(2) receive a further report prior to the expiry of the extended contract as to the position at that time.