



## Notice of meeting of

### Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee

**To:** Councillors Alexander (Chair), Aspden, Fraser, Sue Galloway, Simpson-Laing, Sunderland and Wiseman (Vice-Chair)

**Date:** Monday, 14 December 2009

**Time:** 5.30 pm

**Venue:** The Guildhall, York

### AGENDA

**1. Declarations of Interest (Pages 3 - 4)**

At this point Members are asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on this agenda. A list of general personal interests previously declared are attached.

**2. Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the Committee's remit can do so. The deadline for registering is **5:00 pm on Friday 11 December 2009**.

**3. 2009/10 Finance and Performance Second Quarter Monitoring Report (Pages 5 - 8)**

This report provides an update of the 2009/10 position for both finance and performance in Adult Social Services, the main area covered by the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**4. Referral from the Executive regarding overspends in Adult Social Services (Pages 9 - 14)**

This report details a referral from the Executive regarding overspends in Adult Social Services.

- 5. Feasibility Report - Maternity Matters** (Pages 15 - 26)  
This report asks Members to consider a scrutiny topic registered by Councillor Wiseman on improving care for newborns and new mothers.
- 6. Update Report - Outreach Workers** (Pages 27 - 44)  
This report presents Members of the Committee with an update on a previously registered scrutiny topic regarding 'outreach workers' for further consideration.
- 7. Urgent Business**  
Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972

Democracy Officer:

Name: Jill Pickering

Contact Details:

- Telephone – (01904) 552061
- Email – [jill.pickering@york.gov.uk](mailto:jill.pickering@york.gov.uk)

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democracy Officer responsible for servicing this meeting

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports

Contact details are set out above

## About City of York Council Meetings

### Would you like to speak at this meeting?

If you would, you will need to:

- register by contacting the Democracy Officer (whose name and contact details can be found on the agenda for the meeting) **no later than 5.00 pm** on the last working day before the meeting;
- ensure that what you want to say speak relates to an item of business on the agenda or an issue which the committee has power to consider (speak to the Democracy Officer for advice on this);
- find out about the rules for public speaking from the Democracy Officer.

**A leaflet on public participation is available on the Council's website or from Democratic Services by telephoning York (01904) 551088**

### Further information about what's being discussed at this meeting

All the reports which Members will be considering are available for viewing online on the Council's website. Alternatively, copies of individual reports or the full agenda are available from Democratic Services. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the agenda for the meeting. **Please note a small charge may be made for full copies of the agenda requested to cover administration costs.**

### Access Arrangements

We will make every effort to make the meeting accessible to you. The meeting will usually be held in a wheelchair accessible venue with an induction hearing loop. We can provide the agenda or reports in large print, electronically (computer disk or by email), in Braille or on audio tape. Some formats will take longer than others so please give as much notice as possible (at least 48 hours for Braille or audio tape).

If you have any further access requirements such as parking close-by or a sign language interpreter then please let us know. Contact the Democracy Officer whose name and contact details are given on the order of business for the meeting.

Every effort will also be made to make information available in another language, either by providing translated information or an interpreter providing sufficient advance notice is given. Telephone York (01904) 551550 for this service.

যদি যথেষ্ট আগে থেকে জানানো হয় তাহলে অন্য কোন অর্ধাতে তথ্য জানানোর জন্য সব ধরনের চেষ্টা করা হবে, এর জন্য দরকার হলে তথ্য অনুবাদ করে দেয়া হবে অথবা একজন দোঅবী সর্ববরাহ করা হবে। টেলিফোন নম্বর (01904) 551 550।

*Yeteri kadar önceden haber verilmesi koşuluyla, bilgilerin terümesini hazırlatmak ya da bir tercüman bulmak için mümkün olan herşey yapılacaktır. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

我們竭力使提供的資訊備有不同語言版本，在有充足時間提前通知的情況下會安排筆譯或口譯服務。電話 (01904) 551 550。

اگر مناسب وقت سے اطلاع دی جاتی ہے تو ہم معلومات کا ترجمہ مہیا کرنے کی پوری کوشش کریں گے۔ ٹیلی فون (01904) 551 550

*Informacja może być dostępna w tłumaczeniu, jeśli dostaniemy zapotrzebowanie z wystarczającym wyprzedzeniem. Tel: (01904) 551 550*

### **Holding the Executive to Account**

The majority of councillors are not appointed to the Executive (40 out of 47). Any 3 non-Executive councillors can 'call-in' an item of business from a published Executive (or Executive Member Decision Session) agenda. The Executive will still discuss the 'called in' business on the published date and will set out its views for consideration by a specially convened Scrutiny Management Committee (SMC). That SMC meeting will then make its recommendations to the next scheduled Executive meeting in the following week, where a final decision on the 'called-in' business will be made.

### **Scrutiny Committees**

The purpose of all scrutiny and ad-hoc scrutiny committees appointed by the Council is to:

- Monitor the performance and effectiveness of services;
- Review existing policies and assist in the development of new ones, as necessary; and
- Monitor best value continuous service improvement plans

### **Who Gets Agenda and Reports for our Meetings?**

- Councillors get copies of all agenda and reports for the committees to which they are appointed by the Council;
- Relevant Council Officers get copies of relevant agenda and reports for the committees which they report to;
- Public libraries get copies of **all** public agenda/reports.

## HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

### **Agenda item 1: Declarations of interest.**

Please state any amendments you have to your declarations of interest:

Councillor Fraser	Governor of York Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and as a member of the retired section of Unison; Member of York Healthy City Board.
Councillor Wiseman	Governor of York Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust; Member of York Healthy City Board.

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

14 December 2009

### Report of the Director of Housing & Adult Social Services

## 2009/10 Finance and Performance Second Quarter Monitoring Report

### Summary

1. This report provides an update of the 2009/10 position for both finance and performance in Adult Social Services, the main area covered by the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

### Analysis

#### Finance – overview

2. The net approved budget for Adult Social Services is £40m and, after identifying £665k of in-year savings to address cost pressures in the year, it is currently projected that Adult Social Services will overspend by £1,053k.
3. The underlying causes of the overspend reported at Monitor 1 still exist, namely increases in the number of customers supported at home, increased Direct Payment take up and increases in the number of Mental Health residential and nursing placements. In addition to these issues, the following areas are contributing to the increased forecast:
  - An increase in the staffing establishment at one Elderly Peoples Home (EPH) to respond to an increase in the customers with a very high level of need and to deal with safeguarding issues (£40k).
  - A further increase in the complexity of community based support for Learning Disabilities, in particular a need to provide sleep in cover for more customers (£80k).
  - An increase in the number and cost of residential and nursing placements (£170k).
  - A further increase in the number of Older People needing community based supports (£90k).
  - Continued use of agency staff across front line services (£84k).
4. These overspends are offset by corrective in year action by the directorate of £665k designed to reduce the gross overspend position. This is comprised of the redirection of grants (£389k), reduction in training expenditure (£150k) and vacancy management controls (£126k).
5. The increase in demand from older and disabled people was anticipated and the York Long Term Commissioning Strategy reported to members in October 2007 projected that by 2020 there would be an increase of 31% in the over 65 population and, within this number, an increase in the over 85s of 60%. People over 85 are more likely to need support from health and

social care services. The strategy also went on to project the likely impact on service demands and costs.

6. It is for this reason that the major reviews of direct services were agreed by members and these are being brought within the broader More for York programme. However, within this context of increasing demand it will be very difficult to produce a balanced outturn position in 09/10 in advance of the completion of the major reviews.
7. As part of the budget setting process for 09/10 savings were offered in a number of areas that did not affect service delivery. They included:
  - in increase in the existing vacancy factor by 1% saving £85k.
  - a 1% efficiency against premises, supplies and services budgets and a minor base budget exercise that had been undertaken to drive out further efficiencies saving £200k.
  - Further savings identified corporately in administration, use of external consultants, energy budgets, transport, and improved staff attendance totalling £167k.

Further in-year savings are being sought to try to reduce the level of overspend.

### Performance – overview

8. *NPI 130 (LAA): Self directed support for Adults.* The department continues to make improvements to the number of adults receiving self-directed support, with performance currently running at 8.54% (projecting 14% for year-end). This compares well to the 7.39% outturn for 2008/09 and if achieved, would exceed the 12.5% LAA target and move York from the third to top quartile based on Q1 bench-marking data from other local authorities on the Price Waterhouse Cooper (PwC) database. We have set a more challenging internal target of 15% (which came out of regional improvement meetings) and York's forecast performance would fall 1% short of this.
9. *NPI 135 (LAA): % of carers receiving needs assessments.* Performance is currently running at 16.2%, with a year-end projection of 22.5% (which matches the 2009/10 LAA target). If achieved, this would raise York from the bottom to the third quartile, based on PwC Q1 bench-marking data.
10. *NPIs 132 & 133 – timeliness of social care assessments and packages.* Both these indicators cover areas that need to show improvement to address performance issues highlighted in the last Adult Social Care inspection. Progress so far this year is mixed:
  - Timeliness of assessments: Performance has improved from 67.1% to 78.37%, which exceeds the 2009/10 target of 77%. If this was maintained, it would move York up from the bottom to the 3rd quartile, based on PwC comparative data.
  - Timeliness of care packages: Performance has dropped in the first period of this year (currently 81.6% compared 90.3% in 2008/09). This falls short of the 90% target set for 2009/10 and if no further improvement is made this year, this will move York from 3rd to the



bottom quartile of unitary authorities. There are a number of issues that have caused this drop in performance, including a lack of availability of EMI (elderly mentally ill) beds leading to people having to wait longer from a completed assessment. HASS are taking a number of actions to address performance, including addressing incorrect reporting (i.e. how certain types of residential stays are reported), and improving the delivery of re-enablement home care when people leave hospital is also being explored. These actions should lead to improvement and performance is expected to be closer to target by March 2010.

**Corporate Priorities**

- 11. The information included in this report demonstrates progress on achieving the council's corporate strategy (2007-11) and the priorities set out in it.

**Implications**

- 12. There are no financial, human resources, equalities, legal, crime & disorder, information technology, property or other implications associated with this report.

**Risk Management**

- 13. There are no risks associated with this report.

**Recommendations**

- 14. As this report is for information only, there are no recommendations.

**Contact Details**

<b>Author:</b>		<b>Chief Officer Responsible for the report:</b>			
Debbie Mitchell Head of HASS Finance (01904) 554161		Bill Hodson Director of Housing & Adult Social Services (01904) 554001			
Co-Author's Name		<b>Report Approved</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Date</b>	30-11-09
<b>Specialist Implications Officer(s)</b> <i>None</i>					
<b>Wards Affected:</b> <i>List wards or tick box to indicate all</i>					<b>All</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>					

**Background Papers**

Second Performance and Financial Report for 2009/10,  
Executive 17<sup>th</sup> November 2009

**Annexes**

None

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee

14<sup>th</sup> December 2009

Report of the Interim Head of Civic, Legal & Democratic Services

### Referral from the Executive regarding overspends in Adult Social Services

#### Summary

1. This report details a referral from the Executive regarding overspends in Adult Social Services.

#### Background

2. At a meeting of the Executive held on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2009 information was received on the First Performance and Financial Monitor for 2009/10. On consideration of the information the Executive highlighted the increased demand levels for adult community care packages and care packages as having an impact on the Council's budget. As a result of this they requested that the appropriate Scrutiny Committee review the reasons for and possible options for offsetting the increase in demand for these services. A discussion took place on the adult social care budget pressures at the meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> September.
3. The context for the referral is set out at Annex 1 to this report and this was originally included with the Executive papers dated 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2009.

#### Consultation

4. The Director of Housing & Adult Social Services and the departmental Head of Finance have provided a further monitor report for Members of the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee; this is included on the agenda today. This shows that the projected overspend on adult social care has now risen to about £1.1m from £589k at the last report; so it is clearly a serious situation.
5. Both the Director of Housing & Adult Social Services and the Head of Finance can provide further high-level analysis of where the cost pressures are as a starting point for members of scrutiny should they wish to receive this.

#### Options

6. Members have the following options:

**Option 1** Monitor the situation through regular reports

**Option 2** Call an additional one-off meeting between Members of the Committee, the Director of Housing & Adult Social Services and the Head of Finance to discuss the budget pressures in more detail.

**Option 3** Progress this topic to review clearly indicating which issues need to be addressed and what outcomes could be realistically achieved.

**Option 4** Take no further action

### **Analysis**

7. The continuing cost pressures on adult social care are an issue that Members of this Committee may wish to address in more detail. The situation is common to most Councils with demand increasing related to the significant demographic changes in society. Based on the evidence within this report, its annex and the second quarter monitoring report (contained within this agenda) Members would need to decide what course of action they feel is most appropriate.
8. The Director of Housing & Adult Social Services has indicated that he and the finance officer can provide the Committee with further analysis should they require it.
9. It has also been suggested that a one-off meeting between Members of the Committee, the Director of Housing & Adult Social Services and the Head of Finance to discuss the budget pressures in more detail might assist Members to come to a decision on the most appropriate way forward.
10. When considering how to approach the matter, Members will need to take into consideration their current work commitments.

### **Corporate Strategy 2009/2012**

11. This relates to both the Effective Organisation theme and the Healthy City theme the current Corporate Strategy 2009/2012.

### **Implications**

12. **Financial** – Financial implications regarding the overspend are contained within the second quarter monitoring report which forms part of this agenda. There is a small amount of funding available within the scrutiny budget to carry out reviews. There are no other financial implications associated with this report; however implications may arise should this be progressed to review.
13. **Human Resources** – There are no known Human Resources implications associated with the recommendations within this report.
14. **Legal** – There are no direct legal implications associated with the recommendations within this report; however implications may arise should Members choose to progress this to review.

15. **Other** – There are no known equalities, property, crime & disorder or other implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

### **Risk Management**

16. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations within this report. Possible risks may arise should Members decide to investigate this matter further. However, if the Committee decide to take no further action without establishing the underlying reasons for the overspends, there is a risk that these may not be effectively addressed in the near future.

### **Recommendations**

17. Members are recommended to proceed with option 2 of this report and call an additional one-off meeting between Members of the Committee, the Director of Housing & Adult Social Services and the Head of Finance to discuss the budget pressures in more detail prior to deciding what course of action to take, if any.

Reason: To address the concerns raised by the Executive

### **Contact Details**

**Author:**

Tracy Wallis  
Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Services  
Tel: 01904 551714

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Alison Lowton  
Interim Head of Civic, Legal & Democratic  
Services  
Tel: 01904 551004

Report Approved



Date 01.12.2009

### **Specialist Implications Officer(s)**

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

### **Background Papers:**

Minutes from the Executive meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2009

### **Annexes**

**Annex 1** – Context for the referral

This page is intentionally left blank

**Annex 1****Housing & Adult Social Services Context**

The main areas causing the overspend on Adult Social Services are;

- An increase in the expected number of Mental Health residential and nursing placements – this was an area where the budget was reduced for 09/10 based on previous years' activity
- A continued increase in the volume and complexity of community based support for Learning Disabilities
- A continued increase in the number of Older People needing community based supports
- An agreed budget saving to deliver additional customer income of £180k has not yet been implemented due to the need to complete a full Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) and lack of sufficient resources to complete all the work needed.

The increase in demand from older and disabled people was anticipated and the York Long Term Commissioning Strategy reported to members in October 2007 projected that by 2020 there would be an increase of 31% in the over 65 population, and within this number, an increase in the over 85s of 60%. People over 85 are more likely to need support from health and social care services. The strategy also went on to project the likely impact on service demands and costs.

The table below shows the numbers of people accessing services in 2007, the projections that were made at the time about the increased capacity that was likely to be required by 2010 set alongside the current number of packages in place. This shows that increases are happening broadly in line with the forecast although at a higher rate with a 25% increase in community care packages and a 22% increase in care home placements over the past 2 years.

	Baseline snapshots (as at 17/7/07)	2010 forecast of capacity needed	Actual packages (as at 31/7/09)
Community Based	2635	3104	3322
Residential & Nursing	653	761	797

It is for this reason that the major reviews of direct services were agreed by members and these are being brought within the broader More for York programme. However, within this context of increasing demand it will be very difficult to produce a balanced outturn position in 09/10 in advance of the completion of the major reviews.

As part of the budget setting process for 09/10 savings were offered in a number of areas that did not affect service delivery. They included:

- in increase in the existing vacancy factor by 1% saving £85k.
- a 1% efficiency against premises, supplies & services budgets and a minor base budget exercise that had been undertaken to drive out further efficiencies saving £200k.
- Further savings identified corporately in administration, use of external consultants, energy budgets, transport, and improved staff attendance totalling £167k.





---

## Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee

14<sup>th</sup> December 2009

### Feasibility Report – Maternity Matters

#### Summary

1. At a meeting on 8 July 2009 Councillor Wiseman indicated that she was considering submitting a scrutiny topic on improving care for newborns and new mothers. Members of the Committee indicated that this was potentially a good topic to review and subsequently, in October 2009, Councillor Wiseman submitted a topic registration form. This is attached at Annex A to this report.

#### Criteria

2. Councillor Wiseman has identified the following criteria as being relevant to this topic:
  - Public Interest (i.e. in terms of both proposals being in the public interest and resident perceptions)
  - In keeping with Corporate Priorities
  - National/local/regional significance e.g. A central government priority area, concerns joint working arrangements at a local 'York' or wider regional context
3. Councillor Wiseman also made the following additional comments on the topic registration form in support of the eligibility criteria:
  - **Public Interest** – It is in the public interest that the care provided by Health Visitors for new mothers and their babies from birth to six months be as effective and complete as possible
  - **In keeping with Corporate Priorities** – This fits in with the 'Healthy City' theme of the recently refreshed Corporate Strategy – 'we want to be a city where residents enjoy long, healthy and independent lives. For this to happen we will make sure that people are supported to make healthier lifestyle choices and that health and social care services are quick to respond to those that need them.'
  - **National/local/regional significance** – The Department of Health is emphasising improvements to the care of mothers and their babies as shown by the recent paper 'Maternity Matters'. Also 'Facing the Future: A Review of the Role of Health Visitors'.

## Consultation

4. The following persons were consulted as part of the feasibility process and comments received are set out at Annex B to this report:
  - Executive Member for Children's Services
  - Director of Learning, Culture & Children's Services
  - Representatives of NHS North Yorkshire & York
  - Representatives of York Hospitals Foundation Trust
  - York LINK (Local Involvement Network)

## Options

5. Members are asked to consider the following options:

**Option A**            Progress the topic to review

**Option B**            Do not progress this topic to review

**Option C**            Receive a presentation from NHS North Yorkshire & York on the work being undertaken in this area.

## Analysis

6. Based on the evidence provided in Annex B to this report the Committee are not advised to proceed with this review. NHS North Yorkshire & York are undertaking a piece of work that will culminate in a revised universal services model for 0-19 year olds and this work will take into account how health visiting services are provided in York.
7. There would seem little point in the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee duplicating the work of the Primary Care Trust (PCT) by undertaking a review at this stage. However, they may wish to receive a presentation from NHS North Yorkshire & York to find out more about the work they are undertaking on this subject. It is therefore recommended that the Committee choose Option C as set out in paragraph 5 of this report.
8. Should any review be undertaken it is recommended that the title be changed from 'Maternity Matters' to reflect the nature of the request for a review into the health visitor service, particular in relation to the service they offer to mothers and their babies from birth to six months.
9. Should Members choose to proceed with a review on this topic then a draft remit, scope and timetable will need to be produced. These should clearly define the aim and key objectives of the review. It is suggested that, should these be required, they be drafted at an informal meeting by a small cross-party task group and presented to a future meeting of the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee for formal approval.

10. The topic registration form at Annex A suggests possible consultees and a time frame of 3 to 6 months to complete should the topic be progressed to review.
11. Members will also need to take into consideration commitments already in their work plan and decide where any review would be best placed.

### **Corporate Strategy 2009/2012**

12. The contents of this report and the focus of any review that may be undertaken are directly linked to the 'Healthy City' theme of the Corporate Strategy.

### **Implications**

13. **Financial** – There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations within this report however; should Members of the Committee choose to progress this topic to review implications may arise. There is a small amount of funding in the scrutiny budget to enable reviews to take place.
14. **Legal** – There are no known legal implications associated with the recommendations within this report however; should this topic be progressed to review implications may arise.
15. **Human Resources** – There are no known Human Resources implications associated with the recommendations within this report.
16. There are no known equalities, crime & disorder, information technology or property implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

### **Risk Management**

17. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

### **Recommendations**

18. Members of the Committee are advised to proceed with Option C and request that NHS North Yorkshire & York provide a presentation on the work they are undertaking in relation to this subject.

Reason: To address the concerns raised in the topic registration form.

## Contact Details

**Author:**

Tracy Wallis  
Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Services  
Tel: 01904 551714

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Alison Lowton  
Interim Head of Civic, Legal & Democratic  
Services  
Tel: 01904 551004

**Feasibility Study  
Approved**



**Date** 01.12.2009

Specialist Implications Officer(s) None

Wards Affected:

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

### Background Papers:

None

### Annexes

**Annex A** Topic Registration Form  
**Annex B** Comments from consultees



## SCRUTINY TOPIC REGISTRATION FORM

### PROPOSED TOPIC:

Study into whether the way Health Visitors in York work presently, allows them to offer a full and effective service to mothers and their babies from birth to six months

**COUNCILLOR (S) REGISTERING THE TOPIC:** Councillor S Wiseman

### SECTION 1: ABOUT THE TOPIC

Please complete this section as thoroughly as you can. The information provided will help Scrutiny Officers and Scrutiny Members to assess the following key elements to the success of any scrutiny review:

**How** a review should best be undertaken given the subject

**Who** needs to be involved

**What** should be looked at

**By when** it should be achieved; and

**Why we are doing it ?**

**Please describe how the proposed topic fits with 3 of the eligibility criteria attached.**

*As a general rule, topics will only proceed to review if they meet 3 of the criteria below. However, where it is adequately demonstrated that a topic is of significant public interest and fits with the first criteria but does not meet 3, Scrutiny Management Committee may still decide to allocate the topic for review. Please indicate which 3 criteria the review would meet and the relevant scrutiny roles:*

	✓	Policy Development & Review	Service Improvement & Delivery	Accountability of Executive Decisions
Public Interest (ie. in terms of both proposals being in the public interest and resident perceptions)	✓		✓	
Under Performance / Service Dissatisfaction				
In keeping with corporate priorities	✓		✓	
Level of Risk				
Service Efficiency				
National/local/regional significance e.g. A central government priority area, concerns joint working arrangements at a local 'York' or wider regional context	✓		✓	

**Public Interest:** It is in the public interest that the care provided by Health Visitors for new mothers and their babies from birth to six months be as effective and complete as possible

**In keeping with Corporate priorities:** This fits in with the 'Healthy City' theme of the recently refreshed Corporate Strategy - 'we want to be a city where residents enjoy long, healthy and independent lives. For this to happen we will make sure that people are supported to make healthier lifestyle choices and that health and social care services are quick to respond to those that need them'

**National/local/regional significance:** The Dept of Health is emphasising improvements to the care of mothers and their babies as shown by the recent paper "Maternity Matters". Also "Facing the Future: a review of the role of Health Visitors".

**Set out briefly the purpose of any scrutiny review of your proposed topic. What do you think it should achieve?**

*If you have not already done so above, please indicate in response to this, how any review would be in the public or Council's interest e.g. reviewing recycling options in the city would reduce the cost to the Council for landfill*

This scrutiny review should aim to achieve:

- An understanding of both government and local initiatives in relation to post natal care (health and well-being of both mother and child (until the child reaches 6 months)
- Recommendations for an improved post natal service for all mothers and their new born children (to the age of 6 months)
- A better understanding amongst users/prospective users of the services available to them

It is in both the public and the Council's interest to offer a good service as this will, ultimately improve the standards of health and well being amongst new born children and their mothers.

Good quality care and access to relevant services when they are needed is necessary for healthy and thriving children.

**Please explain briefly what you think any scrutiny review of your proposed topic should cover.**

*This information will be used to help prepare a remit for the review should Scrutiny Management Committee decide the topic meets the criteria e.g. How much recycling is presently being done and ways of increasing it*

- History of both initiatives ('Delivering Healthy Ambitions' & 'Maternity Matters' and background on the services available in York
- Statistic evidence (how many use the service, what services are available, where they are available, how people find out about them)
- How many care centres offer post natal services in York (for both mother and child until 6 months of age)
- Raising awareness – if people are not using the services then why not. Are they aware of how to access them and what is available?
- Will health visitors be able to offer a complete/satisfactory service once the new 'maternity matters' initiative is introduced?
- Could any improvements be made to the service?

**Please indicate which other Councils, partners or external services could, in your opinion, participate in the review, saying why.**

*Involving the right people throughout the process is crucial to any successful review e.g. CYC Commercial Services / other local councils who have reviewed best practice for recycling / other organisations who use recycled goods*

Margaret Jackson- York Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
 NHS North Yorkshire & York  
 Relevant Officers at CYC/Children's Social Services  
 Health visitors/nursing staff/midwives  
 GP Practices (David Geddes)  
 Maternity Services Liaison Committee (MSLC)  
 LINKs  
 Paediatric and SCBU staff York Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
 Health Visitor management staff from NY&Y PCT  
 Mothers

**Explain briefly how, in your opinion, such a review might be most efficiently undertaken?**

*This is not about who might be involved (addressed above) but how the review might be conducted e.g. sending a questionnaire to each household to gather information on current recycling practices and gathering information on how recycling is carried out in Cities similar to York*

1. Receive background information followed by;
2. Informal discussion day on key issues
3. From this may follow specific discussions with certain groups to discuss possibilities for tackling issues/concerns raised at the informal day
4. Leading to recommendations arising from the review

**Estimate the timescale for completion.**

*Please circle below the nearest timescale group, in your estimation, based on the information you have given in this form.*

- (a) 1-3 months;
- (b) **3-6 months**; or
- (c) 6-9 months



PLEASE ENCLOSE ANY SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS OR OTHER INFORMATION YOU FEEL MIGHT BE USEFUL BACKGROUND TO THE SUBMISSION OF THIS TOPIC FOR CONSIDERATION.

Useful documents for background material are:

'Delivering healthy Ambitions'

'Maternity Matters'

Children's National Service Framework

Child Health Promotion Programme (NSF 17 March 2008)

Facing the Future: a review of the role of the Health Visitor (DOH 2007)

Concerns regarding this service were raised at the MSLC meeting initially in the context of no longer having a Health Visitor attending the MSLC which, was feared might be a factor in a break in communication between HV's and other Maternity Service Staff as well as the Paediatric Department. The fact that HV's do not now come to the MSLC seems to be related to their new way of working.

It is important that we put a good service in place from the beginning as Maternity Matters is being introduced at the end of 2009. We need to avoid people slipping through the net and not getting the care and support they need. To date my understanding is that HV's proactively contact women 10 days after they give birth when they take over from the midwife. I am not sure what their schedule of visits is or what their criteria for assessing that a family is "in need" of regular visits. My impression is that this has changed, i.e. been reduced. I am uncertain how HV's interact with GP's.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Maternity Matters – Proposed Scrutiny Topic Consultation Comments**

### **1. Pete Dwyer – Director of Learning, Culture & Children’s Services**

On reflection, it appears from the contents of the form that the topic proposed is looking more to the issues of whether the core health visiting service is meeting the needs of local families. The service has been changing with a more targeted approach - some would also challenge as to whether the level of Health Visitor provision is adequate and I am aware that NHS North Yorkshire & York are undertaking a review of the service and its level of resourcing.

I would defer to others, in particular Rachel Johns, as to whether a scrutiny debate at this stage would add value to those reflections. To be clear, whilst entitled ‘Maternity Matters’ the questions being asked do not pertain to the work of the midwifery service about which I am not aware of any concerns being raised.

### **2. Councillor Runciman – Executive Member for Children’s Services**

The main focus of this topic seems to be on services provided by the PCT and the Acute Hospitals Trust. Although it could relate to provision for post natal care at our Children's Centres and some voluntary sector provision such as the ‘Treasure Chest’ groups, the main source of information should be in places other than CYC.

It could be a valuable topic and it would be interesting to see if there could be an effect on changing outcomes in the service, which is not controlled and managed by the council.

### **3. Margaret Jackson – Head of Midwifery Services – York Hospitals Foundation Trust**

I agree with Pete Dwyer’s comments. In the light of the new policy document it seems appropriate to wait for the local response to this in relation to Health Visitor Services.

### **4. Gareth Whiles - Assistant Director Children, Maternity and Sexual Health - NHS North Yorkshire & York**

Dated 03.11.2009

This is definitely an important area of work as good health visiting services are a vital part of a baby and child development. However there is work being undertaken locally that may affect whether this is the best time to carry out this study.

NHS North Yorkshire and York are beginning a piece of work that will culminate in a revised universal services model for 0-19 year olds that will be

in line with the Healthy Child Programmes for both 0-4 (released nationally in February 09) and 5 – 19 programme released last week. This work has 2 streams to it. The first is aimed at tackling key immediate major capacity concerns. By tackling these immediate issues it will allow time for the longer-term model to be developed and commissioned. This work will obviously take into account how Health Visiting services are provided in York

A workshop is being held later this week with Health Visitors to take the immediate work forward and make recommendations to the NHS North Yorkshire and York Integrated Commissioning Executive Committee (ICE)

The longer stream of work is starting its planning process and will be overseen by ICE but carried out through the PCT Children, Maternity and Sexual Health Commissioning Group with appropriate working group arrangements within this. The exact arrangements and project plans for this work are being finalised but will obviously need to take into account user, staff, and broader stakeholder views and requirements

Paul Murphy, CYC officer, is a member of the PCT Commissioning Group and both he, Gareth Whiles (Assistant Director at the PCT) and Jo Harding (General Manager- Children and Specialist Services North Yorkshire and York NHS Community and Mental Health Services) are members of City of York Integrated Commissioning Group that reports into the YorOk Board. Progress of this work will be fed through the ICG group

With this in mind it is felt that now may not be the appropriate time to undertake a study of this nature

## **5. York LINK**

Members of the York LINK Steering Group think this is a feasible topic for scrutiny and fits with the eligibility criteria set out in the topic registration form.



---

## Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee

14<sup>th</sup> December 2009

Report of the Interim Head of Civic, Legal & Democratic Services

### Update Report – Outreach Workers

#### Summary

1. This report presents Members of the Committee with an update on a previously registered scrutiny topic regarding 'outreach workers' for further consideration.

#### Background

2. At a meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2009 Members considered a scrutiny topic registered by Councillor James Alexander regarding the availability, funding and uniform distribution of access to outreach workers. A copy of the topic registration form is attached at Annex A to this report.
3. A feasibility study was prepared for consideration and this is attached at Annex B to this report.
4. Members of the Committee discussed the report at length and it was resolved:
  - i. That based on the evidence presented within the report Members do not proceed with a scrutiny review on this topic at the present time
  - ii. That the Director of Housing & Adult Social Services (HASS) provide an update report to the Committee, later in the year, detailing the outcome of discussions with stakeholders, representative agencies and providers about the commissioning of services and partnership working to provide these services.
  - iii. That following receipt of this report the Committee give further consideration to the need for a scrutiny review on this matter.
5. Further information has now been prepared by way of a briefing note and this is attached at Annex C to this report. The Director of HASS and the Interim Assistant Director for Commissioning & Partnerships will be in attendance to answer any questions Members may have about the information provided.

## Consultation

6. In addition to the information in Annex C, the Interim Assistant Director for Commissioning & Partnerships has reported that:

‘Broadly speaking, Age Concern agree that the signposting service is not throwing up evidence of need, but they are still offering a Befriending Plus service. This is only funded for one year - and so they are likely to be looking for further funding beyond that. However I would not think that this would warrant a scrutiny review - otherwise they will be inundated with requests for topics from any organisation whose funding is vulnerable.’

## Options

7. Members have the following options:

- Option A** If there are still outstanding issues, progress this topic to review
- Option B** If all issues have now been addressed, do not progress this topic to review
- Option C** Continue to receive regular updates

## Analysis

8. Between 2008 and 2009 Housing and Adult Social Services and the PCT undertook a joint commissioning project to develop services to help support older people within York to live healthier and more independent lives. The briefing note at Annex C outlines how this was done, information on the services available and on those that are forthcoming.
9. The information contained within the briefing note (Annex C) does not appear to highlight any gaps in service. In light of this Members are not advised to progress this topic to review.
10. However, if Members choose to proceed with a review a draft remit, scope and timetable will need to be prepared. These should clearly define the aim and key objectives of the review. It is suggested that, should these be required, they be drafted at an informal meeting by a small cross-party task group and presented to a future meeting of the Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee for formal approval.
11. Members will also need to take into consideration outstanding commitments in their work plan when considering the options within this report.

## Corporate Strategy 2009/2012

12. The contents of this report and the focus of any review that may be undertaken are directly linked to the ‘Healthy City’ theme of the Corporate Strategy 2009/2012.

## Implications

13. **Financial** – There is a small amount of funding available within the scrutiny budget to carry out reviews. There are no other known financial implications associated with this report however; implications may arise should the topic be progressed to review.
14. **Human Resources (HR)** – There are no known HR implications associated with this report.
15. **Legal** – There are no direct legal implications associated with this particular report however; legal implications may emerge should the topic be progressed to review.
16. There are no known equalities, property, crime & disorder or other implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

## Risk Management

17. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, there are no known risks associated with the recommendations within this report.

## Recommendations

18. Based on the information contained within this report and its annexes Members of the Committee are not recommended to progress this topic to review.

Reason: Based on the information contained within this report and its annexes, no gaps in service have been identified.

## Contact Details

### Author:

Tracy Wallis  
Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Services  
Tel: 01904 551714

### Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Alison Lowton  
Interim Head of Civic, Legal & Democratic  
Services  
Tel: 01904 551004

Report Approved

Date 01.12.2009

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** None

**Wards Affected:**

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

## Background Papers:

None

**Annexes**

**Annex A** Topic Registration Form

**Annex B** Feasibility Study dated 05.01.2009

**Annex C** Briefing note on Outreach Workers for Older People





## Scrutiny Topic Registration Form

Fields marked with an asterisk \* are required.

- \* Proposed topic: City of York Council scrutinises the availability, funding and uniform distribution of access to outreach workers (a different entity to a befriending service).
- \* Councillor registering the topic: Councillor James Alexander
- Submitted due to an unresolved 'Cllr Call for Action' enquiry

Please complete this section as thoroughly as you can. The information provided will help Scrutiny Officers and Scrutiny Members to assess the following key elements to the success of any scrutiny review:

**How** a review should best be undertaken given the subject

**Who** needs to be involved

**What** should be looked at

**By when** it should be achieved; and

**Why we are doing it ?**

Please describe how the proposed topic fits with 3 of the eligibility criteria attached.

	Yes?	Policy Development & Review	Service Improvement & Delivery	Accountability of Executive Decisions
Public Interest (ie. in terms of both proposals being in the public interest and resident perceptions)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under Performance / Service Dissatisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In keeping with corporate priorities [We want services to be provided by whoever can best meet the needs of our customers.]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Level of Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Service Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National/local/regional	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

significance e.g. A central government priority area, concerns joint working arrangements at a local 'York' or wider regional context

**\* Set out briefly the purpose of any scrutiny review of your proposed topic. What do you think it should achieve?**

Many people in Holgate ward rely on an outreach worker service from providers such as Age Concern. During the recent dementia review looked at by Health Scrutiny Committee it became clear that this service is different from a befriending service and the outreach worker service was unequally available across the city (due to the way individual Ward Committees allocated their funding) and that this outreach worker service will cease in March 2009.

The review should: -Look at how to maintain the provision that has occurred over previous years -Indicate how this service can be more equally distributed across the city - Indicate how this service will be funded -List what providers are available -Make clear council obligations regarding this service

**\* Please explain briefly what you think any scrutiny review of your proposed topic should cover.**

-Look at how to maintain the provision that has occurred over previous years -Indicate how this service can be more equally distributed across the city -Indicate how this service will be funded -List what providers are available -Make clear council obligations regarding this service

**\* Please indicate which other Councils, partners or external services could, in your opinion, participate in the review, saying why.**


Older people, Older People's Champion (CYC), those with disabilities, carers, those who use or have used the outreach worker service, Adult Social Services (CYC), Neighbourhood Services (CYC), the general public, Voluntary Organisations: e.g. Age Concern, Older People's Assembly.

The above people can provide information on how the service has been run and funded in the past, their experiences of the service and what value it can give. They can also provide information on what kind of service and funding would be needed in the future.

**\* Explain briefly how, in your opinion, such a review might be most efficiently undertaken?**

It is my impression that this should be looked at by an existing scrutiny committee. The members should clearly make the distinction between a befriending and outreach service. Members should look at how this service has worked in the past; look at the effect of such a service stopping. Investigate possible replacement services and indicate possible providers and funding.

Estimate the

 1-3 months

timescale for  
completion.

- 3-6 months
- 6-9 months

**Support documents or other useful information** None

---

Date submitted: Friday, 28th November, 2008, 12.27 pm

Submitted by: Councillor James Alexander

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## Health Scrutiny Committee

5<sup>th</sup> January 2009

### Feasibility Report – Access to Outreach Workers

#### Summary

1. This report asks Members to consider a scrutiny topic registered by Councillor Alexander to scrutinise the availability, funding and uniform distribution of access to outreach workers (a different entity to a befriending service). A copy of the topic registration form is attached at Annex A to this report.

#### Criteria

2. Councillor Alexander believes that this topic fits with the following eligibility criteria as set out in the topic registration form:
  - Public Interest (i.e. in terms of both proposals being in the public interest and resident perceptions)
  - In keeping with Corporate Priorities [We want services to be provided by whoever can best meet the needs of our customers]
  - National/local regional significance e.g. a central Government priority area, concerns joint working arrangements at a local 'York' or wider regional context.

#### Background Information

3. In his topic registration form, Councillor Alexander stated that many people in Holgate Ward rely on an outreach worker service from providers such as Age Concern. During the recent Dementia Review looked at by the Health Scrutiny Committee it became clear that this service was different from a befriending service. Outreach workers usually provided practical assistance and were paid; whereas the befriending service tended to concentrate on social visits and staff were normally volunteers. It also came to light that the outreach worker service was unequally available across the city (due to the way that Ward Committees allocated their individual budgets). In previous years Age Concern had bid for funding for the scheme but they had made the decision not to apply for funding for 2009/10.
4. Members of the Health Scrutiny Committee had not felt that discussions on the future of the outreach service fitted with the agreed remit of the Dementia Review, as the service was much wider reaching and did not just affect those suffering from dementia. It was therefore decided not to include a

recommendation on this subject; but it was suggested that it could be a topic in its own right should anyone wish to submit it.

### **Consultation**

5. Councillor Sue Galloway, the portfolio holder for Housing and Adult Social Services (HASS) made the following comments:

‘Outreach workers are also employed in the NHS so I think we need to be clear exactly what is being proposed. My understanding is that it is the narrow remit of ward funded support workers that is being put forward as a topic.’

‘On the assumption that Councillor Alexander is referring to the former Ward Committee scheme due to end in 2009, this was not a scheme aimed specifically for dementia sufferers but was aimed at promoting independence amongst elderly people to counter social isolation and was first started in Westfield Ward as a result of a Health Needs Assessment in 2001. It was a Ward Committee funded scheme, which could be cut if residents did not vote for the service. The scheme was provided by Age Concern who, earlier this year, decided not to bid for the scheme for the forthcoming year 2009/10. In so far as Westfield Ward was concerned, Councillors had already expressed their concerns about people moving through the scheme and it was difficult to know the outcomes for this service.’

‘In HASS there is a home support team and a promoting independence team which, subject to eligibility criteria, would meet the needs of people who used to access the previous Ward funded schemes. The option would be open for Councillor Alexander to either fund a Ward Committee scheme through Ward budgets or to make a growth bid in the forthcoming budget.’

6. Councillor Ann Reid, the portfolio holder for Neighbourhood Services made the following comment:

‘As far as Neighborhood Services are concerned if these kinds of schemes are funded by Ward Committees then it is purely based on residents’ votes. If people feel that a good scheme has been proposed then they will vote for it. We certainly can’t divert Ward Committee funds to a citywide scheme as this would fly in the face of the long established principles of Ward Committee budgets.’

7. The Head of Neighbourhood Management and Business Support has made the following comments:

‘Ward Committees have funded Community Support Outreach Workers for a number of years. This has been done through one provider (Age Concern), who has applied for grant provision from a number of wards. The level of support has expanded considerably since the first Ward was approached (Westfield). In 2008/09 ten out of eighteen Ward Committees are providing funding. On an annual basis the level of funding provided via the Ward Committee had altered as have the actual Ward Committees making the

provision. This is logical, as the areas needing provision will have changed over time, as will the priorities of members of the public.

The Ward Committee process for applying for grants has been approved via the Executive Member for Neighbourhood Services and Advisory Panel (EMAP), following a recent review of policy and practice (EMAP 19th March 2008). The process was also called in via Scrutiny and reported back to Neighbourhood Services EMAP in April 2008.

The review of the application process looked at the national practice as well as consultations with the voluntary and community sectors on the proposals, in line with the York Compact. Part of the review was to strengthen the measures in place to ensure that the applicants are demonstrating local need and local (Ward based) delivery, thus meaning that blanket bids for funding across all Wards would not be accepted. This has now ensured that the Ward Committee process is more robust under the requirements of the Constitution and the financial regulations.

Since the introduction of the new application process Age Concern has not applied for funding. They have written to all Ward Members to inform them of their decision. In their letter they have stated that:

" The level of funding has been unpredictable making it difficult to effectively resource the service...."

The Ward Committee budget is present to deliver local services and improvements based on local need and priorities, voted for by the public. Providing a blanket service across the city is not something that would be provided via the Ward Committee setting.

We have a transparent and open process that enables a level playing field for all applicants. As a service we cannot force agencies and the third sector to apply for money.'

8. The Director of Housing and Adult Social Services has made the following comments:

- Effective community support and supportive neighborhoods are key issues for the quality of life in the city and the ability of vulnerable people to live independent and fulfilling lives.
- There is a major role for health, housing and social care to play in this but it is clearly about people's whole lives and therefore goes beyond HASS and into most other areas of council responsibility.
- I think it is important to focus on the outcome of sustainable and supportive communities in which vulnerable people can live safely and independently rather than focusing on a specific service - in this case outreach workers from Age Concern. I'm not sure how a scrutiny process could deal with the specific issue and link in with the budget setting and the associated commissioning/procurement processes.
- HASS are involved in discussions with a range of stakeholders, representative agencies & providers about commissioned services that would

support the broad outcome. This is largely within the context of the changing demographic profile of York and the implementation of the government's initiative "Putting People First". Other departments will be involved in complementary activities in terms of commissioning and partnership working but this is not co-coordinated in the council.

- There is a delicate balance to be struck between local initiatives and having a consistent level of support in all parts of the city
- Other agencies and partners are critical to this and so there is a role for the Local Strategic Partnership in shaping community support networks.
- The initiative in Westfield ward could be useful in informing future options at a neighborhood level.

My view would therefore be:

- If this were to be put forward as a scrutiny topic it ought to be more broadly focused on the outcome (sustainable neighbourhoods for vulnerable people) rather than starting with the input (how are outreach workers funded).
- This could be a potentially big piece of work involving staff from more than one department and would generate considerable interest from agencies outside the council who would want to provide evidence. I therefore doubt whether the topic could be concluded in 1-3 months.

9. Councillor Alexander has suggested that the following persons and organisations be consulted during the course of the review:

- Older Persons
- People with disabilities that may wish to access this service or who have previously used this service
- Carers
- Adult Social Services (CYC)
- Neighbourhood Services (CYC)
- Age Concern & other relevant voluntary organisations
- The public

## **Analysis**

10. It should be noted from the comments above that it is not within a Local Authority's remit to insist that third sector organisations apply for monies. There had also previously been difficulties in collating the outcomes for the outreach worker service. Further problems regarding re-allocating Ward Committee funds to a citywide scheme would also need to be resolved and it was more than likely that this would be directly against the long established principles of Ward Committee budgets.

11. It should also be noted that the processes for applying for grants had already been called in via the scrutiny function once before and had been reported back to Neighbourhood Services EMAP in April 2008. Members should therefore consider whether re-scrutinising the subject could provide further insight.



## Conduct of Review

12. However, were this review to go ahead the Committee should look at how the service has worked in the past and look at the effect of such a service stopping. They should also investigate the possibility of replacing the service and indicate possible providers and funding sources.
13. Councillor Alexander has suggested that this review should look at:
- How the provision that has been provided in previous years could be maintained
  - How the service could be more equally distributed across the city
  - How the service can be funded
  - What providers are available to offer the service
  - What the Council obligations are regarding this service
14. It is estimated that this review would take approximately one to three months to complete.

## Implications

15. **Financial** - There is a small amount of funding available within the scrutiny budget to carry out reviews. There are no other known financial implications associated with this report however; implications may arise should the review be progressed.
16. **Human Resources (HR)** - There are no known HR implications associated with this report.
17. **Legal** – There are no direct legal implications associated with this particular report however; legal implications associated with this topic may emerge if the topic progresses.
18. **Other** – There are no known equalities, property, crime and disorder or other implications associated with the recommendations within this report.

## Risk Management

19. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, there are no known risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

## Recommendation

20. Based on the evidence presented within this report Members are not advised to proceed with this review. However, if this were to be put forward as a scrutiny topic it ought to be more broadly focused on the outcome (sustainable neighborhoods for vulnerable people) rather than starting with the input (how are outreach workers funded) and a revised topic registration form would need to be submitted.

Reason: On the basis that the voluntary sector agencies are not obliged to apply for funding and that the Ward Committee process for applying for grants had been called in via the scrutiny function before in April 2008, there was therefore, little to be gained from scrutinising the same subject twice.

### Contact Details

**Author:**

Tracy Wallis  
Scrutiny Officer  
Scrutiny Services  
Tel: 01904 551714

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Quentin Baker  
Head of Civic, Legal & Democratic Services  
Tel:  
01904 551004

Feasibility Study  
Approved



Date 18.12.2008

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)**

None

**Wards Affected:**

All



For further information please contact the author of the report

**Background Papers:**

None

**Annexes**

**Annex A**      Topic Registration Form

## Briefing Paper for Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

### Outreach Workers for Older People

1. In January 2009 Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered whether to commission a scrutiny report on the funding of community outreach workers for older people.
2. It was agreed that the topic would not be pursued at that stage, but that the Director of Housing and Adult Social Services (HASS) would provide a report to the committee later in the year detailing the outcome of discussions with stakeholders, representative agencies and providers about the commissioning of services that would support the broad outcomes of ensuring effective community support.
3. Between 2008 and 2009 Housing and Adult Social Services led a joint commissioning project with the Primary Care Trust, to develop services to help support older people to live healthier and more independent lives for longer within the City.
4. The project was undertaken jointly, between the PCT the Council and the local practice based commissioning consortium, York Health Group, with input from local voluntary organisations and from representatives of older people from the York Older People's Assembly.
5. In May 2008 a consultation exercise, supported by voluntary organisations, produced over 700 replies to a questionnaire, which included questions, about what services should be more widely available for older people to be helped to live more independently.
6. Over three quarters of respondents thought that handyperson services (72%), one point of contact to get information about what help / advice / activities are available (68%), a footcare / toenail cutting service (67%) are the most important to make more widely available.
7. Practical help with shopping and gardening and support for those living with dementia were the next most popular responses, with 60% of respondents identifying each of these areas.
8. 49% wanted to see more schemes to visit people in their own home or to help them to be more involved in activities outside the home. 39% wanted to see more local programmes of social activities for older people and 31% wanted to see more sport and physical activities for older people.
9. As a result of the survey it was agreed that the joint commissioning project would focus initially on the top three priorities, and during 2009 the project team developed specifications and plans to deliver these priorities.

10. Two have already been addressed, with the commissioning of a handypersons scheme, provided by Yorkshire Housing, through the Supporting People programme, and the commissioning of an advice and signposting service for older people and their families, provided by Age Concern.
11. Both services started operating in March/April 2009. Both are city wide services, rather than locality focused, to ensure that access is available wherever someone lives. Both services have now been operating for about 6 months and contract monitoring reports indicate that they are delivering well on the objectives and outcomes set within the contracts.
12. The advice and signposting service (First Call Fifty+) has received 220 enquiries in the first 6 months, resulting in nearly 500 referrals on for support and advice. Early indications from customer satisfaction surveys indicate that 92% of people using the service were satisfied and felt they had benefited from the service, 1% were not satisfied and 6 % did not say.
13. In this first six months there were eight enquiries, which resulted in referrals on for either emotional support/mental health issues and 37 to voluntary or community groups, and there were no unmet needs identified in respect of these issues. This would suggest that there is not currently a gap in support available in these areas.
14. It needs to be noted that Age Concern report that they were successful in securing a one year grant from HBOS which has enabled them to provide a 'Befriending Plus' service. This has provided support to 27 people since April 2009, to help people increase their level of social contact, on a more intensive basis than their usual befriending service.
15. The highest demand to the new signposting service is for help with repairs and home maintenance (76 enquiries). The new handypersons scheme has been in high demand, with referrals both from the signposting service and from other sources. There have been some delays in responding to do the work as a result of this. 185 people used the service in the first quarter and 186 in the second quarter. No customer satisfaction surveys have yet been undertaken.
16. A third new service should be operating by the end of this year, offering an affordable toenail cutting and footcare service as a social enterprise.
17. Alongside the commissioning of new services a new role of Community Facilitator has been developed within HASS. Three posts have been funded through the transforming social care grant to work with community groups and with service users to enable better access to community activities for vulnerable people.

18. The work of these posts has included supporting the development of older people's groups, including helping groups access exercise sessions and danceability classes
19. They have also worked with individuals, signposting and linking them to support, and intend to be developing this further to reach more people in the future.

Kathy Clark  
Interim Assistant Director Commissioning and Partnerships  
Housing and Adult Social Services

This page is intentionally left blank