

DECISION-MAKER:	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
SUBJECT:	ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY OPTIONS FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE
DATE OF DECISION:	8 NOVEMBER 2012
REPORT OF:	CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SERVICES
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY	
None	

BRIEF SUMMARY

This report provides an update on the findings of Pricewaterhouse Cooper which informed a final decision about the future delivery model for in house social care. A decision was made on the 25th September 2012 to retain the provision within the Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (i) That the Committee discuss the issues raised within the report.

REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To respond to a request from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee at its meeting in December 2011.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

2. Different delivery options for the Council's directly provided adult social care were identified in the report that went to the OSMC in November 2011.

DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)

3. Following completion of the work identified to OSMC in February 2012, a further appraisal of the options was completed by members of the HR team, a senior manager of social care from the IOW, a local NHS commissioner, a member of the finance team and members of the policy team. This was led by the Senior Manager for Customer and Business Improvement. This appraisal found that a conclusive recommendation could not be made.
4. The Chief Executive, with agreement from the Deputy Leader of the Council as chair of the Change Programme Board, commissioned Pricewaterhouse Cooper (PwC) to undertake a short piece of work to provide the City Council with an objective external assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the work that had been developed internally and of the best strategic and financial fit of future direction to our HASC services.
5. The work that was then undertaken by two members of PwC over two weeks concluded that the two main options that had been identified as viable in previous work were the same options that they felt could be considered, these being moving to a trading company or retaining the provision in house. However, they identified that the business case for the LATCo had been heavily reliant on having a two tier work force which this Administration was not prepared to implement and had not focussed on the added value that in house services provide. Furthermore they made it clear that making a decision about the future of provision must be based on greater clarity about the direction of commissioning and that a clear strategic direction was awaited by the end of the year. They considered that many of the reasons given for

moving to a LATCo could actually be achieved in house if the Council environment were to be more receptive.

6. The presentation given by PwC is provided as an appendix. This was presented to the Change Programme Board on the 25th September 2012 where it was decided that social care services would be retained in house. However, it was also clear that these services would be given support to change and develop to meet the changing national agenda and local demands. Further more the Change Programme Board committed to overcoming as much as possible the areas of the Council's processes that PwC had identified as barriers to flexible use of the service provision.
7. The future of the relevant services is now focussed on:
 - Working on delivering better outcomes for all users of social care services;
 - Creating and implementing a better commissioning strategy across all Council services; and
 - Shaping the social care market so the Council can have a stronger say over quality and outcomes, whoever the providers of those services are in the City.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Capital/Revenue/Property/Other

8. There are no direct financial implications of the recommendations in this paper. Access may be made to the Change Programme Board /Transition Board for some project support to maximise the development of in house care services.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

9. None required

Other Legal Implications:

10. None

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

11. Policy implications resulting from the national changes currently under focus for Adult Social care will be taken into account in future service development.

AUTHOR:	Name:	Jane Brentor, Head of Provider Transformation	Tel:	023 8083 3439
	E-mail:	jane.brentor@southampton.gov.uk		

KEY DECISION? No

WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:	None
------------------------------------	------

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line

Appendices

1.	Presentation from PwC to Change Programme Board.
----	--

Documents In Members' Rooms

	None
--	------

Integrated Impact Assessment

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out?	No
--	----

Other Background Documents

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	None	
----	------	--