

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Executive Director (Legal & Democratic Services)

to

Cabinet

on

Tuesday, 14th January 2021

Agenda
Item No.

Report prepared by: S. Tautz (Principal Democratic Services Officer)

In-Depth Scrutiny Report – ‘The appropriate use of reablement for older people (65 and over) when discharged from hospital, to maximise the number of people at home after period of 91 days.’

**Relevant Scrutiny Committee(s): People Scrutiny Committee
Cabinet Member: Councillor T Harp
Part 1 (Public Agenda Item)**

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To present the final report of the scrutiny project – ‘The appropriate use of reablement for older people (65 and over) when discharged from hospital, to maximise the number of people at home after period of 91 days.’

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 **That Cabinet approve the report and recommendations arising from the in-depth scrutiny project, detailed at Paragraph 4 of this report.**

3. Background

- 3.1 At its meeting held on 9 July 2019, the People Scrutiny Committee agreed that an in-depth study be undertaken to consider the appropriate use of reablement services by the Council (Minute 172 refers). The project plan for the study was agreed by the Committee at its meeting on 8 October 2019 (Minute 398 refers).
- 3.2 The project was led by a member Project Team and the appointments were agreed at Council on 16 May 2019. The Project Team comprised the following Members: Councillors F Evans (Chair), A Dear, D Garne, M Borton, C Nevin, A Chalk, I Shead and A Thompson. Mr T Watts of the Southend Carers Forum was co-opted as a member of the Project Team and Councillor L Salter also attended meetings of the Project Team.
- 3.3 Officer support for the project was provided by Sarah Baker (Director of Adult Social Care), Lynn Scott, (Head of Adult Social Care), Gemma Czerwinke (Service Manager (Adult Social Care)) and Fiona Abbott/Steve Tautz (Project Coordinators).

- 3.4 Progress with regard to the review was achieved in the first half of the 2019/20 municipal year, including the development of an action plan, the receipt of relevant presentations and the holding of appropriate site visits. However, the completion of the projects was subsequently delayed from late-2019 as a result of a number of issues including reduced officer capacity in key service areas.
- 3.5 From March 2020, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic also further delayed activity with regard to the completion of the review, reflecting the Council's approach to the handling of the pandemic, including the necessary focus on priority activities and the delivery and implementation of the Coronavirus Act 2020, which changed the lead responsibility for all discharges from hospital to Health. As a result, it was not possible for the in-depth review to be completed by the end of the municipal year and the Committee agreed that it be carried forward into the current municipal year.
- 3.6 The draft final report arising from the in-depth scrutiny project was agreed by the People Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 24 November 2020 (Minute 582 refers). An overview of the evidence considered by the Project Team is set out in the report.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 In accordance with Scrutiny Procedure Rule 10 (Part 4(e) of the Constitution), the report of the in-depth scrutiny report is attached at Appendix 1 for approval by the Cabinet.
- 4.2 The recommendations from the review are set out in Section 9 of the report. There are no recommendations arising from the review that have budget implications that require consideration as part of future years' budget processes prior to implementation.
- 4.3 The overarching recommendations from the review are as follows:
- (a) That performance against the ASCOF2B2 indicator continue to be reported as part of the Council's regular corporate performance report.
 - (b) That, on the relaxation of the relevant provisions of the Coronavirus Act 2020 and with regard to the Council's ongoing performance against the ASCOF2B2 indicator at that time, consideration be given to the identification of measures to further improve the delivery of reablement services by the Council, if required.
- 4.4 In considering the report of the in-depth scrutiny report, the People Scrutiny Committee also agreed the following:
- (a) That the Council's monthly performance against the national performance indicator (ASCOF2B2) that measures the proportion of older people (65 and over) offered reablement services following discharge from hospital, be reported to the Committee on an ongoing basis.
 - (b) That the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Social Care be requested to seek the continuation of the funding previously provided by the Clinical

Commissioning Group on a pilot basis, for the package of follow-up support provided by Southend Association of Voluntary Services as part of the discharge to assess arrangements, in order to maintain contact with patients discharged into Pathway 0 and the provision of relevant assistance and guidance.

- 4.5 The Cabinet is requested to endorse the recommendations arising from the in-depth scrutiny project.

5. Other Options

- 5.1 To note the report but not progress any of the recommendations.

6. Reasons for Recommendations

- 6.1 Not applicable

7. Corporate Implications

- 7.1 Contribution to the Southend 2050 Road Map

In the context of the Southend 2050 Vision, the main focus of the project was to consider whether the current service offered accessible and effective care, delivered to the right people, in the right place and at the right time.

- 7.2 Financial Implications

There are no recommendations arising from the review that have budget implications that require consideration as part of future years' budget processes prior to implementation.

- 7.3 Legal Implications

None

- 7.4 People Implications

None

- 7.5 Property Implications

None

- 7.6 Consultation

As described in the report

- 7.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

Any future revisions to the provision of reablement services would need to be subject to an assessment of equality and diversity implications. However, no such service changes are recommended as a result of the in-depth scrutiny project.

7.8 Risk Assessment

None

7.9 Value for Money

None

7.10 Community Safety Implications

None

7.11 Environmental Impact

None

8. Background Papers

None

9. Appendices

Final report of the Project team (Appendix 1)