AGENDA ITEM NO 9





ANGUS HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE INTEGRATION JOINT BOARD – 26 OCTOBER 2022 SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION REVIEW UPDATE REPORT BY GAIL SMITH, CHIEF OFFICER

ABSTRACT

Following the Integration Joint Board (IJB) decision on 22 June 2022 to move to a concierge model of delivery for supported accommodation at Provost Johnston Road, Montrose and St Drostan's Court, Brechin an engagement plan was developed and implemented. Provost Johnston moved to the concierge service on 1 September 2022 and it is planned that St Drostan's will change by end of the 2022. This report provides detail on the change process and on any outstanding issues.

1. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Integration Joint Board:-

(i) Accepts the content of this report, which provides an update on progress in implementing the concierge model in two supported housing complexes since June 2022.

2. BACKGROUND

At a meeting of the IJB on 22 June 2022, (IJB Report 32/22) it was agreed to proceed with a move to a concierge model at St Drostan's Court, Brechin and Provost Johnston Road, Montrose. It was noted that a responsive service to meet residents' needs would remain available 24 hours per day. An update was requested by the IJB for its October 2022 meeting.

3. CURRENT POSITION

Following the IJB, a briefing paper was circulated to tenants, relatives, unpaid carers, other affected stakeholders and staff. An engagement plan was developed to ensure that all relevant stakeholders were informed, and that regular, clear and consistent communication would take place.

Our objective was to achieve the aim of minimising impact and supporting tenants, families and staff as much as possible by approaching this change in a planned and phased way, taking into account their individual and collective needs.

The tenants and families were offered the opportunity to discuss the decision of the IJB and to agree a plan for implementation. Over the past 3 months we have worked with tenants, families and providers to change all packages of internal care and support provision over to independent providers. Individual meetings took place with tenants and their families to progress a change of provider of care and support using the Self-Directed Support (SDS) legislation/framework. The involvement of an advocate was offered where appropriate.

Significant work has taken place to consider alternative delivery models for the administration of medication. Day-time medication administration will be carried out by care providers or the District Nursing service, depending on the individual case. Night-time medication will be administered by the District Nursing Iona service and the use of prompting to enable tenants to be able to self-administer is in place.

There was regular communication with staff, including formal briefings and individual meetings, to aid the progression of staffing options. We have ensured that we have followed the Angus Council Managing Workforce Change process. Of the 8 Social Care Officers employed over the two supported accommodation facilities, all but 1 have opted to revert to Social Care Worker posts. Successful redeployment has been achieved for the other worker in a matched post. A matched alternative post was identified for the driver/attendant who worked across both supported accommodation facilities.

All staff will continue to receive the salary of the social care officer on a cash conserved basis for a period of up to one year. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. The relevant trade union officials were engaged in the process.

Provost Johnston moved to the concierge model on the 1^{st of} September 2022. All stakeholders were notified formally of this change, including the Care Inspectorate as the it will no longer be required to be a registered service.

It is anticipated that the move to a concierge model at St Drostan's will be implemented at the end of 2022.

There has been a consequence arising from the change for a small number of tenants who are self-funding, as they will have to meet the enhanced management payment for the concierge model of delivery, on top of the rent and service payments. The other tenants are not affected as these costs are met through housing benefit. Meetings are being offered by the service with tenants to discuss the payments and implications for them. Advice is also available through the welfare benefits team; referrals can be made to welfare benefits to ensure benefits maximisation.

There has been no impact regarding referrals to either service as a result of the change.

4. PROPOSALS

The IJB are asked to note the update on progress in implementing the concierge model in the two supported housing complexes since June 2022.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

As noted in report 32/22 to the IJB, a financial saving of c£127k is expected, noting that a target of £100k was set against this project.

6. RISK

There are no risks identified.

7. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

An Equality Impact Assessment is attached at Appendix 1.

8. DIRECTIONS

The Integration Joint Board requires a mechanism to action its strategic commissioning plans and this is provided for in Section 26 to 28 of the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014. This mechanism takes the form of binding directions from the Integration Joint Board to one or both of Angus Council and NHS Tayside.

Direction Required to Angus Council, NHS Tayside or Both	Direction to:	
	No Direction Required	X
	Angus Council	
	NHS Tayside	
	Angus Council and NHS Tayside	

REPORT AUTHOR: George Bowie, Head of Community Health and Care Services

EMAIL DETAILS: tay.angusahscp@nhs.scot

List of Appendices:

Appendix 1 Equality Impact Assessment

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

BACKGROUND

Date of Assessment:	22.9.2022
Title of document being assessed:	Supported Accommodation Review
1. This is a new policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed.	This is an existing policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed?
(If Yes please check box)	(If Yes please check box) x □
This is a new budget saving proposal	This is an existing budget saving proposal being reviewed
(If Yes please check box) □	(If Yes please check box) x□
2. Please give details of the Lead Officer and the group responsible for considering the Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)	Lindsey Foreman - Service Leader, Accommodation and Home Care
Please give a brief description of the policy, procedure, strategy or practice being assessed, including its aims and objectives, actions and processes.	In 2019, the Angus Health and Social Care Partnership planned to move to a model of providing full personal care and support in the supported housing complexes at St Drostan's Court, Brechin, and Provost Johnston Road, Montrose, as an on-site provider. This approach was based on predicting a continued high number of older people in these two complexes. In the last eighteen months, however, the balance of provision in the supported housing complexes has changed with more tenants having learning or physical disabilities and fewer older people. People with learning or physical disabilities usually have well-established care packages provided by external providers and do not wish to change their provider when they enter their tenancies. This has meant that our on-site model is no longer viable as the housing complexes do not have enough older people to make the model work, both financially and in terms of ensuring that staff are effectively utilised. An options appraisal was carried out and presented at the Angus Care Model group. The options appraisal considered a number of variables and identified four potential models of care. The main objective of each option was to ensure a sustainable and efficient service could be delivered both now and, in the future, considering the changing demographics of tenants in these supported accommodation facilities. At a meeting of the Integration Joint Board (IJB) on

22 June 2022 (report 32/22 "Supported Accommodation Review") it was agreed to proceed with a move to a concierge model at St Drostan's Court, Brechin and Provost Johnston Road, Montrose.

4. What are the intended outcomes of this policy, procedure, strategy or practice and who are the intended beneficiaries?

Due to low demand for the in-house personal care service in both St Drostan's and Provost Johnston Road, officers carried out an options appraisal to review potential future models of support at these complexes. Consultation then took place with tenants, staff, family members and other key stakeholders to identify the best option, informed by the consultation feedback.

5. Has any local consultation, improvement or research with protected characteristic communities informed the policy, procedure, strategy or practice being EQIA assessed here?

If Yes, please give details.

Research has been conducted around the changes in demographics of those who take up tenancies in these supported accommodation complexes with a shift from those over 65 years of age to those under the age of 65. Those under the age of 65 tend to want to remain with their private provider for their care and support rather than select the in-house service for their personal care. This has resulted in a reduction in demand for the in-house personal care service at these two complexes. An options appraisal was undertaken reflecting care models, workforce and financial aspects. A stakeholder analysis was undertaken to identify all key stakeholders. This included tenants, family members and staff of the 2 supported accommodation complexes.

A programme of consultation was developed, and methods of consultation were identified to meet the varying needs of different stakeholders. A suite of consultation materials was developed to support the consultation programme. These include a briefing paper providing background information and the rationale for the consultation and an options paper detailing all the options and the factors to be considered in identifying the impact of the options, which included a feedback form. The consultation process commenced on 6 December 2021 and remained open until 21 January 2022, allowing a period of 7 weeks for meaningful consultation to take place. The consultation programme helped to inform any future decision on which model of care should be offered at these supported accommodation complexes going forward to ensure it is both financially sustainable and an effective use of staffing resource. The supported accommodation complexes in scope are St Drostan's Court, Brechin and Provost Johnston Road, Montrose,

Following the IJB, a briefing paper was circulated to tenants, relatives, unpaid carers, other affected stakeholders and staff. An engagement plan was developed and implemented to ensure that all relevant stakeholders were informed, and that regular, clear and consistent communication has taken place.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EQIA) - RELEVANCE SCREENING

1. Has the proposal already been assessed via an EQIA process for its impact on ALL of the protected characteristics of: age; disability; gender; gender re-assignment; pregnancy/maternity; marriage and civil partnership; race; religion and belief; and sexual orientation?

Yes (EQIA of 5.9.2021)

1 a. Does the proposal have a potential to impact in ANY way on the public and/or service users holding any of the protected characteristics of age; disability; gender; gender reassignment; pregnancy/maternity; marriage and civil partnership; race; religion and belief; and sexual orientation?

Yes Proceed to the Full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA).

1 b. Does the proposal have a potential to impact in ANY way on <u>employees</u> holding any of the protected characteristics of age; disability; gender; gender re-assignment; pregnancy/maternity; marriage and civil partnership; race; religion and belief; and sexual orientation? This applies to employees of not only NHS Tayside and Angus Council, but also the 3rd sector.

Yes - Proceed to the Full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA).

2. Name: Lindsey Foreman

Position: Service Leader



FULL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EQIA)

Step 1.

Is there any reason to believe the proposal could affect people differently due to their protected characteristic? Using evidence (e.g. statistics, literature, consultation results, etc.), justify whether yes or no. If yes, specify whether impact is likely to be positive or negative and what actions will be taken to mitigate against the undesired impact of a negative discrimination. When considering impact, please consider impact on: health related behaviour; social environment; physical environment; and access to & quality of services of NHS Tayside, Angus Council or 3rd sector social justice.

1a. The <u>public and/or service users</u> holding the Protected Characteristics:

	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	Intended mitigating actions against the b)
	a)Positive Action	b)Negative discrimination	Negative Discrimination
AGE		Yes, there will be a negative impact as the service provided are for an age range of tenants between 31-95 years of age	The welfare of the tenants affected is paramount, and they will remain at the centre of any plans going forward. We will aim to minimise impact and to support tenants, families, and staff as much as possible by approaching this in a planned way, taking into account their needs, and by ensuring that clear and consistent communication and engagement take place.
GENDER			
DISABILITY		Yes, there will be a negative impact as the service provided is for older people and those with disabilities. Some people affected will have dementia and may also have other physical or learning disabilities or long-term conditions	The welfare of the tenants affected is paramount, and they will remain at the centre of any plans going forward. We will involve and engage with tenants, families and health professionals to ensure the health needs of the tenants are fully taken into account. Advocacy support will be offered to any affected tenants.
ETHNICITY/ RACE			
SEXUAL ORIENTATION			

RELIGION/ BELIEF		
GENDER REASSIGNMENT		
PREGNANCY/ MATERNITY		
OTHER: CARERS OF OLDER AND/OR DISABLED PEOPLE		
(Although carers are not considered as a PC in itself, they are protected by the Equality Act		
2010 from "discrimination by association" with the PCs of age and disability)		

1b. The $\underline{\text{employees}}$ holding the Protected Characteristics:

	POSITIVE IMPACT	NEGATIVE IMPACT	Intended mitigating actions against the b)
	a)Positive Action	b)Negative discrimination	Negative Discrimination
AGE		Yes – there may be impact on staff as they fall within the ages of 40-62 years of age. There are 6 staff in scope	Any decision made is likely to have a direct effect on some staff in relation to service changes and ways of working. Our desire is to avoid any compulsory redundancies and work will be ongoing to identify alternative employment options through the Council's Managing Workforce Change policy.
GENDER		Yes – the majority of the workforce who are in scope are female.	Any decision made is likely to have a direct effect on some staff in relation to service changes and ways of working. Our desire is to avoid any compulsory redundancies and work will be ongoing to identify alternative employment options through the Council's Managing Workforce Change policy. Although the majority of the workforce are female, there is no difference in how female employees are supported. All employees, regardless of their gender, will be supported with the same options and opportunities as specified in the 'Managing Workforce Change' Policy.
DISABILITY			It is possible that some staff may have disabilities. We would ensure, through the 'Managing the Workforce Change' process that any disabilities were taken fully into account when considering

			This would include identifying any reasonable adjustments that would be required.	
ETHNICITY/ RACE				
SEXUAL ORIENTATION				
RELIGION/ BELIEF				
GENDER REASSIGNMENT				
MARRIAGE/CIVIL PARTNERSHIP				
PREGNANCY/ MATERNITY				
OTHER: CARERS OF OLDER AND/OR DISABLED PEOPLE (Although carers are not considered as a PC in itself, they are protected by the Equality Act 2010 from "discrimination by association" with the PCs of age and disability)			It is possible that some of the staff affected are also unpaid carers. We would ensure, through the 'Managing the Workforce Change' process that their caring responsibilities were taken fully into account when considering alternative employment opportunities.	
1c. Does the proposal promote good relations between any of the Protected Characteristics?				
YES	NO □	X NOT	SURE	
Specify further (e.g. l	Specify further (e.g. between which of the PCs, and in what way, or why not or not sure)			

alternative employment opportunities.

1d. What steps will you take to collect the Equality Monitoring information needed to monitor impact of this proposal on PCs, and when will you do this?

Equality monitoring information is collected annually in line with the equalities mainstreaming outcomes and monitoring arrangements.

Where will the Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) be published?

Angus Health and Social Care Partnership page on Angus Council website

CONTACT INFORMATION

Name of Department or Partnership:	Angus Health and Social	Angus Health and Social Care Partnership	
Type of Document			
Human Resource Policy			
General Policy			
Strategy/Service		Х	
Change Papers/Local Procedure			
Guidelines and Protocols			
Other (please specify):			
Manager Responsible	Author Responsible		
Name: George Bowie	Name: Lindsey Forema	Name: Lindsey Foreman	
Designation: Head of Community Health an Care Services	Designation: Service Leader, Home Care and Accommodation		
Base: Angus House, Forfar	Base: Ravenswood, Forfar		
Telephone 01307491806	Telephone:		
Email: tay.angushscp@nhs.scot	Email: tay.angushscp@nhs.scot		
Signature of author of the policy:	Date: 22.9	9.22	
Lindsey Foreman			
Signature of Director/Head of Service:	Date: 22.0	9.22	
George Bowie			
Name of Director/Head of Service: George Bowie			
Date of Next Plan Review: N/A			

For additional information and advice please contact: tay.angushscp@nhs.scot